



Aalborg Universitet

AALBORG UNIVERSITY
DENMARK

INOPS Survey data report UK

Survey results on the organisation, management and performance of road and park maintenance service provisions in Local Authorities in the UK

Lindholst, Andrej Christian; Nielsen, Alex Skøtt

Publication date:
2017

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication from Aalborg University](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Lindholst, A. C., & Nielsen, A. S. (2017). *INOPS Survey data report UK: Survey results on the organisation, management and performance of road and park maintenance service provisions in Local Authorities in the UK*. Department of Political Science, Aalborg University.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal -

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at vbn@aub.aau.dk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

INOPS Survey data report UK

Survey results on the organisation, management and performance of road and park maintenance service provisions in Local Authorities in the UK

Authors

Andrej Christian Lindholst

Alex Skøtt Nielsen

Centre for Organization, Management and Administration

Department of Political Science

Aalborg University

Fibigerstræde 1, DK-9220 Aalborg

January 2017

Contents

FOREWORD	6
INTRODUCTION	8
MATERIALS AND METHODS	9
DATA.....	11
CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS AND MUNICIPALITIES	12
Summary	12
General characteristics of Local Authorities in the UK.....	13
Gender characteristics of primary respondents	17
Age characteristics of primary respondents	18
Employment characteristics of primary respondents	19
Experience of working with the private sector	20
Experience of working with in-house service providers.....	21
SERVICE PROVISION: PROVIDERS, PURPOSE AND SUPPORT	24
Summary	24
The use of different of types of service providers	25
The use of providers other than private contractor and in-house providers for provision of parks maintenance services.....	26
Purposes for using private contractors and in-house providers	28
Political and administrative support.....	30
MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATION.....	32
Summary	32
Formal management of private providers	34
Formal management of in-house providers	35
Size of park and road maintenance budgets.....	36
Management approach and relations to providers	37
Organizational and managerial separation of in-house provision of maintenance	40
Transactional characteristics of park and road maintenance services.....	41
Mutual institutionalization of behavioural norms	43
Organizational change and economic pressure	45

PROCUREMENT, MARKETS AND CONTRACTS	47
Summary	47
Procurement and markets	49
Contracts	51
OUTCOMES, EFFECTS AND PERFORMANCE.....	55
Summary	55
Performance evaluations	58
Cost effects of contracting out	61
Quality effects of contracting out.....	62
Cost effects as a result of in-house maintenance work being subject to tender competition.....	63
Quality effects as a result of in-house maintenance work being subject to tender competition	64
Competition effects on internal service management and provision	65
Expected future contribution of different organisations to parks and roads maintenance	67
Drivers for change.....	70
Barriers to change	71
SURVEY	72

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Characteristics of Local Authorities in the UK.....	13
Table 2. Comparison of mean population size of Local Authorities in the dataset	14
Table 3. Distribution of Local Authorities in the dataset according to Local Authority type in the UK.....	15
Table 4. Distribution of Local Authorities in the dataset according to country within the UK.....	16
Table 5. Respondents: Distribution according to gender	17
Table 6. Respondents: Distribution according to age groups	18
Table 7. Respondents: Distribution according to years of employment in current Local Authority and the public sector	19
Table 8. Level of experience of working with the private sector	20
Table 9. Level of experience of working with in-house service providers	21
Table 10. Level of experience of working with service providers other than private contractors and in-house providers.....	22
Table 11. Distribution in the dataset of overall responsibilities of the respondents' departments	23
Table 12. The use of different provider types for provision of parks and road maintenance services	25
Table 13 the use of other types of providers of parks maintenance services (only or partly)	26
Table 14 Current distribution (un-weighted) of parks and roads maintenance budgets between different types of service providers.....	27
Table 15 Purposes for using private contractors (parks and roads)	28
Table 16. Purposes for using in-house provision (parks and roads)	29
Table 17 Political and administrative support for contracting out.....	30
Table 18. Political and administrative support for in-house provision	31
Table 19. Formal contract dimensions for managing and organizing provision of park and road maintenance services by private contractors.....	34
Table 20. Formal instruments for managing and organizing in-house providers	35
Table 21. Size of park and road maintenance budgets for departments* (mill. £)	36
Table 22. Characteristics of English Local Authorities' management of private contractors	37
Table 23. Management of in-house provider	38
Table 24. Contract management capacity for managing private contractors.....	39

Table 25. The degree of organizational and managerial separation of in-house provision of maintenance	40
Table 26. General transactional characteristics of maintenance services provided by private contractors.....	41
Table 27. General transactional characteristics of maintenance services provided in-house	42
Table 28. The degree of institutionalization of behavioural norms in relations with private contractors.....	43
Table 29. The degree of institutionalization of behavioural norms in the internal relations with an in-house provider	44
Table 30. Experienced and expected organizational change	45
Table 31. Experienced budget pressure.	46
Table 32. Procurement of park and road maintenance in UK: Cost and quality effects.....	49
Table 33. Risks and barriers for using private contractors (parks and roads).....	50
Table 34. Number of contracts with private contractors.....	51
Table 35. Contract period for park maintenance contracts	52
Table 36 Contract period for road maintenance contracts	53
Table 37. Average contract period (in years) for parks and roads maintenance contracts	54
Table 38. Performance evaluations of private contractors' provision of road and park maintenance services.....	58
Table 39. Performance evaluations of in-house provision of road and park maintenance services ..	59
Table 40. Performance evaluations of other types of provision of road and park maintenance services.....	60
Table 41. Direction of self-reported estimates on cost change from last times services were contracted out.....	61
Table 42. Direction of self-reported estimates on quality change from last times services were contracted out.....	62
Table 43. Direction of self-reported estimates on cost change as a result of in-house maintenance work being subject to tender competition	63
Table 44. Direction of self-reported estimates on quality change as a result of in-house maintenance work being subject to tender competition	64
Table 45. Effects from the use of private contractors on in-house service provisions of parks and road maintenance	65
Table 46. Effects from the use of private contractors on local planning and management of parks and road maintenance.....	66

Table 47. Expected change in contribution of private contractors to parks and roads maintenance. 67

Table 48. Expected change in contribution of in-house providers to parks and roads maintenance. 68

Table 49. Expected change in contribution of other types of providers to parks and roads
maintenance.69

Table 50. Drivers for change in the way Local Authorities deliver maintenance70

Table 51. Barriers to change in the way Local Authorities deliver maintenance71

FOREWORD

This data report provides statistics on the organization, management and performance of different ways of providing maintenance services within the municipal park and road sector(s) in Denmark. The statistics rely on data collected in the period from September 2015 to November 2015 through an online survey send to managers in all Local Authorities in the UK (England, Wales and Northern Ireland).

The data report is a part of a research project with the title *'Innovations in the organization of public-private collaboration in an international perspective with focus on technical maintenance services'* (acronym: INOPS).¹ Overall, INOPS seeks to address the following three primary research questions in relation to marketization of maintenance services within the municipal park and road sector:

1. *Which forms of contracting out and public-private co-operations are used and considered by municipalities in Denmark, Sweden, Norway and England?*
2. *Which driving forces, considerations and rationales are in play in the various countries when municipalities develop and implement various forms of public-private co-operation?*
3. *What are the requirements/conditions, advantage and disadvantages of various forms of contracting out and public-private co-operation within the individual countries and between the countries?*

A part of the output from INOPS is altogether four data report including data for Denmark, Norway, Sweden and England. The data underlying the reports provide one source for addressing the three research question.

INOPS is carried out in collaboration between researchers from Denmark, Norway, Sweden and England. INOPS has been led by Andrej Christian Lindholst and Morten Balle Hansen, Aalborg

¹ The original Danish title of the research project is: *'Innovationer i organiseringen af det offentlige-private samspil i et internationalt perspektiv med fokus på kommunaltekniske driftsopgaver'* with the abbreviated title *'innovationer i det offentlige private samspil'*. The Danish acronym for the title is: 'INOPS'.

University. Partners in Sweden have been Ylva Norén Bretzner and Johanna Selin, School of Public Administration, Gothenburg as well as Bengt Persson and Thomas Barfoed Randrup, Swedish Agricultural University, Alnarp. The partner in Norway has been Merethe Dotterud Leiren, Norwegian Centre for Transport Research. Partners in England have been Mel Burton and Nicola Dempsey, University of Sheffield and Peter Neal, Peter Neal Consulting Ltd. Partners in Denmark have been Ole Helby Petersen, Roskilde University and Kurt Houlberg, KORA. The project has been co-financed by Hedeselskabet Strategi & Innovation and Aalborg University. Hedeselskabet Strategi & Innovation has been represented by Lisbeth Sevel.

Without the contributions from a long list of people and organizations it would not have been possible to carry out the various research tasks in INOPS. The partners in INOPS especially thank all employees in the municipal park and road departments that devoted some of their time to answer our survey. The partners would also thank colleagues at Aalborg University and managers in municipal park and road departments which provided feedback in the design of the survey as well as on the findings from the survey.

INTRODUCTION

This data report provides descriptive statistics on the organization, management and performance of different ways of providing maintenance services within the park and road sector(s) in Local Authorities in the UK. The statistics summarise data collected from September to November 2015 through an online survey sent to park and road managers in 391 Local Authorities in the UK. The report does not provide any in-depth analysis of the data.

The data report is structured in two main sections. The section on ‘Methods and Materials’ shortly explains how the survey designed, how data was collected and how the resulting dataset was analysed. In addition, the section evaluates the representativeness of the dataset. The section on ‘Data’ report key descriptive statistics for all questions in the survey. The section firstly presents key statistics on the characteristics of the survey’s primary respondents as well as the included municipalities in the dataset. Secondly, the section presents key statistics on how the provision of maintenance services for parks and roads are organized and managed. Thirdly, the section presents key statistics on the performance of various ways of organizing and managing the provision of maintenance services for parks and roads.

Separate appendices contain the original version of the survey and the text(s) used for invitation and reminder of respondents.

The provided statistics in the report are not intended to be read in any particular order, i.e. from start to the end. A reader is welcomed to use the list of tables to find statistics of particular interest. It should be noted that the dataset provides almost endless opportunities for generating statistics and the present report only contains the most fundamental key statistics for individual questions in the survey. Further analysis is done in subsequent publications, communications and eventual upon request.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The dataset for the present report was collected as part of a larger research project (INOPS) on the use of various arrangements for providing parks and roads maintenance services at the level of local governments / municipalities in Denmark Sweden, Norway and England. The dataset for the report was generated through a survey distributed electronically to Local Authorities in the UK in the period from September to November 2015. The data collection period included altogether three rounds of reminders send to non-responding contacts.

Items in the survey were designed to uncover key dimensions of the ways service provisions are organized and managed and how various types of organization and management perform. Earlier research was reviewed in order to provide a theoretical framework for important constructs and guide the operationalization of these constructs. Several pilot tests with respondents and researchers were carried out based on draft versions and later a revised electronic version of the survey. Both the number, wording and response scales for items in the survey were adjusted according to the provided feedback. In the final survey, most items used 11-point numeric response scales with two anchors. Both one-dimensional (e.g. from ‘not at all’ to ‘very high degree’) and two-dimensional scales (e.g. from ‘very un-satisfied’ to ‘very satisfied’) were used pending on the individual item. The survey also included some items which used categorical response scales (e.g. ‘yes’ or ‘no’) as well as ordinal scales. An open response option (for comments) was furthermore included for all items.

The target population for the survey was all Local Authorities in the UK. Primary respondents were midlevel managers in the municipal organization with responsibilities for roads and/or park services. Primary respondents were selected by their expected insights in operational dimensions as well as strategic dimensions of service provisions. Due to variations in internal organisation of park and road responsibilities it was necessary in some cases to identify more than one respondent for some municipalities. List of respondents and contact details was collected through contact with professional associations, inspection of websites and direct contact. More than 400 respondents were included in a final list.

Data collection was carried out electronically in the survey program ‘SurveyXact’. An initial invitation was subsequently followed by three rounds of electronic reminders targeted respondents that didn’t respond firstly as well as respondents that had provided partial answers.

The final dataset consists of replies from respondents which provided complete or partial complete data entries in the online survey. In some cases where entries from multiple respondents for a Local Authority were present it was necessary to select entries from one respondent or merge partial entries. In this process one respondent was identified as the primary respondent for the municipality. Key criteria for selection of primary respondents were: position in the hierarchy, job title and responsibilities of the respondent's department. Any non-completed questions from a primary respondent were eventually filled with completed questions from other (secondary) respondents in the same municipality.

The final dataset included data for organization of parks and/or roads services for altogether 122 out of a total of 391 – equal to 31.2% – Local Authorities in the UK. 122 Local Authorities provided specific data for the organisation of road maintenance and 67 Local Authorities provided specific data for the organisation of park maintenance. Three out of the 122 Local Authorities could subsequently not be identified. The number of identifiable Local Authorities in the dataset ($N = 119$) equal 30.4 % of all Local Authorities in the UK.

Statistical tests for differences between identifiable Local Authorities included cases in the dataset (119) and all UK Local Authorities (391) revealed a significant statistical difference for population size. The average population of Local Authorities included in the dataset is 197,000 where the mean population of all UK Local Authorities is 165,209 (2014 figures). The result shows that the data set tends to represent larger Local Authorities in the UK.

The average age of primary respondents for each Local Authority was 50 years with a standard deviation of 6.9 years ($N = 60$). The average tenure in the public sector and current Local Authority for respondents were respectively 24.0 years ($N = 84$, S.D. = 10.5) and 17.0 years ($N = 85$, S.D. = 11.1). Only 19 % of primary respondents were females.

The software package SPSS 23.0 has been used for organizing all data and as the primary tool for statistical analysis and computation of statistics. The report relies mainly on descriptive statistics in the presentation of survey data, but some explorative and comparative analysis is provided as well. All statistics is summarized in tables and/or figures. The original survey items, upon which the data generation and statistics is based, are found in a separate appendix (not included in this document).

DATA

CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS AND MUNICIPALITIES

Summary

This section provides short descriptive statistics on the respondents and the municipalities in this survey as well as providing analysis of the representativeness of the dataset.

A total of 122 out of 391 Local Authorities equal to 31.2% of all Local Authorities in the UK are represented in the dataset. Analysis for representativeness regarding population size showed that the data set tends to represent larger UK Local Authorities.

The average age for primary respondents is 50 years and more than half of all respondents (59.3%) are aged between 45 and 54 years. 55.7% of all primary respondents are men. Virtually all respondents are aged 40 years or older (90.1%). The average length of employment in the current Local Authority for primary respondents is 17.0 years while the average employment in the public sector is 24.0 years. Only 13.1% of primary respondents have been employed in the public sector for 10 years or less while 38.8% have been employed in their current Local Authority for 10 years or less.

The three most widespread managerial responsibilities for the departments of primary respondents are: Operational planning (respectively 90.2% for parks and 44.3% for roads), Budget planning (91% and 41%) and monitoring of maintenance (respectively 89.3% and 49.2%). The least widespread responsibility is planning, strategy and development (respectively 67.2% and 34.4%).

Experience of working with the private sector was evaluated at both the personal level and at department level a scale from 0 (none at all) to 10 (a very high degree). At both levels the level of experience of working with the private sector was found to be relatively high (mean scores = 8.0 and 8.1). Experience of working with in-house service providers was evaluated at both the personal level and at department level a scale from 0 (none at all) to 10 (a very high degree) as well. At both levels the level of experience of working with in-house providers was found to be very high (mean scores = 9.1 and 9.2).

General characteristics of Local Authorities in the UK

Table 1 shows key characteristics of English Local Authorities within the four countries in the UK. Overall, differences in the English Local Authorities' population are relatively small between the countries. The average number of inhabitants for Local Authorities in the UK is 165,209. The average population for Local Authorities in the UK is largest for Local Authorities in Northern Ireland (167,318 inhabitants) and smallest for Wales (140,547 inhabitants). Among all Local Authorities in the UK Isles of Scilly, England, has the smallest population (2,280 inhabitants) and Birmingham, England, has the largest population (1,101,360 inhabitants).

Differences in Local Authority size measured by physical area are relatively large between the countries. The average physical size among Local Authorities in the UK is 795 km². The average physical size for Local Authorities in the UK is largest for Local Authorities in Scotland (2,435 km²) and smallest for Local Authorities in England (400 km²). Among all Local Authorities in the UK, the geographically smallest Local Authority is City of London, England (3 km²), and Highland, Scotland, is the largest (25,675 km²).

Table 1.
Characteristics of Local Authorities in the UK

Country	Number of Local Authorities	Local Authority size within country (population) ^a		Local Authority size within country (area, km ²)		Population per area (km ²) within country
		Mean	Total	Mean	Total	Mean
England	326	166,615	54,316,618	400	130,308	417
Northern Ireland	11	167,318	1,840,498	1,301	14,315	129
Scotland	32	167,113	5,347,600	2,435	77,910	69
Wales	22	140,547	3,092,036	943	20,736	149
All of the UK	391	165,209	64,596,752	622	243,296	266

Note: all figures based on 2014 data from Office for National Statistics

Characteristics of Local Authority size

Table 2 provides a comparison of mean size in the dataset with the mean size of 119 Local Authorities included in the dataset.

The average population of Local Authorities included in the dataset is 197,000. The average population of all UK Local Authorities is 165,209. An independent t-test found that the difference in population size between the Local Authorities who are represented in the dataset ($n = 119$) and the total population ($n = 391$) is statistical significant ($p = .034$). The result shows that the Local Authorities represented in the data set on the average are significantly larger than all Local Authorities.

Table 2.
Comparison of mean population size of Local Authorities in the dataset

	N	Population 2014	
		Mean	S.D.
All UK Local Authorities	391	165,209	112,308
Included in survey	119	197,000	161,245

N = 391

Data is based on population size of UK Local Authorities for 2014. Data source: Office for National Statistics

Independent T-test shows a statistical significant difference between means for cases with available survey data and the total population, $t(118) = 2,151$, $p = .034$.

Distribution and representativeness of Local Authorities in the dataset

Table 3 provides an overview of the distribution of Local Authorities in the dataset and all Local Authorities in the UK according to type. For altogether 119 cases (Local Authorities) information was provided. Three cases could not be identified according to type of Local Authority.

‘Local Authority type representativeness’ is highest for the Local Authority type of ‘Metropolitan’ with data provided for 38.9% of all Local Authorities of this type in the UK. The representativeness is lowest for ‘District’ type of Local Authorities with data provided for 26.9% of all Local Authorities of this type. Altogether 30.4% or 119 out of all 391 Local Authorities are included in the dataset.

Table 3.
Distribution of Local Authorities in the dataset according to Local Authority type in the UK

Distribution of Local Authorities in the dataset according to Local Authority type in the UK					
Type	Frequencies				Local Authority type representativeness ^b
	All Local Authorities		Local Authorities in dataset ^a		
	Absolute	Relative	Absolute	Relative	
<i>Metropolitan</i>	36	9.2 %	14	11.5 %	38.9 %
<i>London Borough</i>	32	8.2 %	9	7.4 %	28.1 %
<i>Unitary</i>	89	22.8 %	33	27.0 %	37.1 %
<i>District</i>	234	59.8 %	63	51.6 %	26.9 %
<i>All</i>	391	100 %	119	100 %	30.4 % (31.2 %)

The table shows the distribution of Local Authorities according to Types in the UK (England, Wales, Northern Ireland and Scotland). Data source: Office for National Statistics

^a Three Local Authorities in the dataset could not be grouped within the four main types and are not included.

^b ‘Regional representativeness’ indicates the number of Local Authorities in the dataset as percentage of all Local Authorities according to Type. Figure in bracket is based on 122 Local Authorities in dataset.

Table 4 provides an overview of the distribution of Local Authorities in the dataset and all Local Authorities in the UK according to country. Data for identification of country was provided for all 122 cases (Local Authorities) in the dataset.

Country representativeness is highest for the country of Wales with data for 54.5% of all Local Authorities in the country and lowest for Northern Ireland with data for 13.6% of all Local Authorities in the country. The country representativeness for England and Scotland is almost the same (respectively 31.6 % and 31.3 %).

Table 4.
Distribution of Local Authorities in the dataset according to country within the UK

Distribution of Local Authorities in the dataset according to country within the UK					
Country	Frequencies				Country representativeness ^b
	All Local Authorities ^a		Local Authorities in dataset		
	Absolute	Relative	Absolute	Relative	
<i>England</i>	326	83.4%	103	84.4%	31.6%
<i>Northern Ireland</i>	11	2.2%	6	4.9%	54.5%
<i>Scotland</i>	32	8.1%	10	8.2%	31.3%
<i>Wales</i>	22	5.6%	3	2.5%	13.6%
<i>All</i>	391	100%	122	100%	31.2%

The table shows the distribution of Local Authorities in 2014 according to Country context in the UK (England, Wales, Northern Ireland and Scotland). Data source: Office for National Statistics

^a Includes Metropolitan, London, Unitary and District types of Local Authorities.

^b 'Regional representativeness' indicates the number of Local Authorities in the dataset as percentage of all Local Authorities according to Country context.

Gender characteristics of primary respondents

Table 5 provides an overview of the distribution of gender for primary respondents for all cases in the dataset.

For 38 out of the 122 responding Local Authorities no direct information on the respondent's gender was provided. For those Local Authorities where gender information was provided (84 Local Authorities) most respondents are males (81 %). Only 19 % (or 16 out of 84) of the respondents are female.

Table 5.
Respondents: Distribution according to gender

Gender of primary respondent	Frequencies	
	Absolute	Relative
Female	16	13.1%
Male	68	55.7%
No information	38	31.1%
Total	122	100%

N (valid) = 84

The table shows the distribution of primary respondents according to gender.

Survey item: Q40

Age characteristics of primary respondents

Table 6 provides an overview of the age of primary respondents for each Local Authority in the dataset. For altogether 80 cases (Local Authorities) information on the age of the primary respondent was provided.

Almost all primary respondents are aged 40 years or more. The average age is 50 years and more than half of the respondents (59.3%) are between 45 and 54 years old.

Table 6.
Respondents: Distribution according to age groups

Respondents: Distribution according to age groups											
N	Mean	S.D.	Distribution in age groups								
			Age 30 – 34	Age 35 – 39	Age 40 - 44	Age 45 - 49	Age 50 - 54	Age 55 - 59	Age 60 – 64	Age 65 or more	
60	50	6.9	Absolute	2	6	6	22	26	14	5	0
			Relative	2.5%	7.4%	7.4%	27.2%	32.1%	17.3%	6.2%	0%

N = 60

The table shows the distribution of primary respondents according to age group.

Data is based on the following question: "In what year were you born?"

Survey item: Q40.

Employment characteristics of primary respondents

Table 7 provides an overview of the distribution of primary respondents according to years of employment in their current Local Authority and in the public sector in general.

The average length of employment in the current Local Authority for primary respondents is 17.0 years while the average employment in the public sector is 24.0 years. Only 13.1% of primary respondents have been employed in the public sector for 10 years or less while 38.8% have been employed in their current Local Authority for 10 years or less.

Table 7.
Respondents: Distribution according to years of employment in current Local Authority and the public sector

Distribution for years of employment in current Local Authority and the public sector									
Years of employment in	N	Mean	S.D.		0 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 - 30 years	more than 30 years
Current Local Authority	85	17.0	11.1	Absolute	12	21	21	15	16
				Relative	14.1%	24.7%	24.7%	17.6%	18.8%
The public sector	84	24.0	10.5	Absolute	3	8	21	26	26
				Relative	3.6%	9.5%	25.0%	31.0%	31.0%

N = 85

The table shows the distribution of primary respondents according to years of employment in their current Local Authority and in the public sector in general.

Data is based on the following questions: "how many years have you been employed with your current Local Authority?" and "how many years have you been employed in the public sector?"

Survey items: Q40

Experience of working with the private sector

Table 8 shows the average experience of working with the private sector among respondents as well as their estimates of their departments' experience of working with the private sector as a whole.

At both personal and department level the level of experience of working with the private sector is relatively high (mean scores = 8.0 and 8.1). The variation at both levels is relatively low to moderate (S.D. = 2.0 and 2.3).

Table 8.
Level of experience of working with the private sector

Experience of working with the private sector at:	N	Mean	S.D.
<i>Personal level</i>	69	8.0	2.0
<i>Department level</i>	69	8.1	2.3

N = 69

The table shows the degree of experience respondents have of working with the private sector. As well as the respondents estimates of the departments' level of working with the private sector as a whole.

** All items measured on an 11-point response scale with anchors (0 = 'none at all' and 10 = 'a very high degree') for two questions regarding the degree of experience of working with the private sector on both private and department level.*

Survey Item: Q4a

Experience of working with in-house service providers

Table 9 shows the average experience of working with in-house service providers among respondents as well as their estimates of their departments' experience of working with in-house service providers as a whole.

At both personal and department level the level of experience of working in-house service providers is very high (mean scores = 9.1 and 9.2). The variation at both levels is relatively low (S.D. = 1.5 in both cases).

Table 9.
Level of experience of working with in-house service providers

Experience of working with in-house service providers at:	N	Mean	S.D.
<i>Personal level</i>	78	9.1	1.5
<i>Department level</i>	78	9.2	1.5

N = 78

The table shows the degree of experience respondents have of working with in-house service providers. As well as the respondents estimates of the departments' level of working with in-house service providers as a whole.

** All items measured on an 11-point response scale with anchors (0 = 'none at all' and 10 = 'a very high degree') for two questions regarding the degree of experience of working with in-house service providers on both private and department level.*

Survey Item: Q19a

Experience of working with other types of service providers

Table 10 shows the average experience of working with other types of service providers among respondents as well as their estimates of their departments' experience of working with other types of service providers as a whole.

At both personal and department level the level of experience of working with other types of service providers is moderately high (mean scores = 7.9 and 8.0). The variation at both levels is relatively low (S.D. = 1.9 and 1.7).

Table 10.
Level of experience of working with service providers other than private contractors and in-house providers.

Experience of working with other types of service providers at:	N	Mean	S.D.
<i>Personal level</i>	49	7.9	1.9
<i>Department level</i>	50	8.0	1.7

N = 50

The table shows the degree of experience respondents have of working with other types of service providers. As well as the respondents estimates of the departments' level of working with other types of service providers as a whole.

** All items measured on an 11-point response scale with anchors (0 = 'none at all' and 10 = 'a very high degree') for two questions regarding the degree of experience of working with other types of service providers on both private and department level.*

Survey Item: Q32a

Responsibilities of primary respondent's departments

Table 11 provides an overview of the distribution in the responsibilities of the respondent's department. Information on the responsibilities of the department was provided for altogether 122 cases (Local Authorities).

The three most widespread responsibilities for the departments of primary respondents are: Operational planning (respectively 90.2% for parks and 44.3% for roads), budget planning (91.0% and 41.0%) and monitoring of maintenance (89.3% and 49.2%). The least widespread responsibility is planning, strategy and development (67.2% and 34.4%). All departments of primary respondents have responsibilities for one or more tasks within park administration, while almost half of departments of primary respondents (45.1%) have no responsibilities for any task within road administration.

Table 11.
Distribution in the dataset of overall responsibilities of the respondents' departments

Responsibility	Parks		Roads	
	Absolute	Relative	Absolute	Relative
Planning, strategy and development	82	67.2%	42	34.4%
Administration	82	67.2%	38	31.1%
Operational planning	110	90.2%	54	44.3%
Monitoring of maintenance	109	89.3%	60	49.2%
Provision of maintenance operations (provider function)	92	75.4%	52	42.6%
Budget planning and responsibility	111	91.0%	50	41.0%
Site development	106	96.9%	-	-
No responsibilities	0	0%	55	45.1%
All Local Authorities	122	100%	122	100%

N = 122

The table shows the distribution in the dataset of the overall responsibilities of the respondent's department.

Data is based on replies to questions whether the respondent's department had responsibility for seven different tasks within park administration and six different tasks within road administration.

Survey item Q2

SERVICE PROVISION: PROVIDERS, PURPOSE AND SUPPORT

Summary

This section provides data and statistics on who provides maintenance services, the purpose of using different service providers as well as the internal backing for the use of different types of service providers.

54.9% of English Local Authorities use private contractors for park maintenance while 41.8% of Local Authorities use private contractors for road maintenance. 69.7% of English Local Authorities use in-house providers for park maintenance and 67.2% use in-house providers for road maintenance. Only few Local Authorities rely exclusively on private contractors for either park or road maintenance (14.8% for park maintenance and 22.4% for road maintenance). For park maintenance 46.7% of all Local Authorities partly use other types of provision. Of Local Authorities that use other types of provision, 83.6% have indicated a use of community groups for park maintenance. Generally, English Local Authorities partially use private providers as well as in-house providers for maintenance of roads. For park maintenance, Local Authorities use private providers and in-house providers as well as other types of provision.

The (un-weighted) average allocation of maintenance budget for private contractors is 34.8% for park maintenance and 32.3% for road maintenance. The variation in the allocation of maintenance budgets between private contractors and in-house provision is considerable for both park maintenance (S.D. = 43.4%) and road maintenance (S.D. = 47.1%).

The highest ranked purposes for using private contractors are '*cost effective maintenance*' and '*high maintenance quality*' while the highest ranked purposes for using in-house provision are '*to ensure flexible maintenance*' and '*high quality maintenance*'. The political support for contracting out (mean = 5.0) is found to be slightly lower than the administrative support (mean = 5.6). The degree of continued debates about the use of contracting out is scored relatively low at both the political and administrative level (mean scores = 3.2 and 3.7). The political and administrative support for using in-house provision is found to be scored higher than the support for contracting out (mean scores = 7.8 and 7.5). The degree of continued debates about the use of in-house provision is scored relatively low at both the political and administrative level (mean scores = 3.6 and 3.8).

The use of different of types of service providers

Table 12 provides an overview of English Local Authorities' use of different provider types for provision of park and road maintenance services. All 122 (100%) Local Authorities use some type of provider of park maintenance while only 67 (54.9%) of the Local Authorities use some type of provider of road maintenance.

The percentage of Local Authorities that only or partly use private contractors is slightly higher for park maintenance services (54.9%) compared to road maintenance services (41.8%). The percentage of Local Authorities that only use in-house providers is higher for road maintenance services (26.2%) than for park maintenance services (47.8%). 50% of Local Authorities use other types of provision for park maintenance while only 13.4% of Local Authorities use other types of provision for road maintenance.

Table 12.
The use of different provider types for provision of parks and road maintenance services

Type of provider	Park maintenance N = 122	Road maintenance N = 67
Use private contractors (only or partly)	54,9% (67)	41,8% (28)
<i>Only use private contractors</i>	14,8% (18)	22,4% (15)
<i>Partly use private contractors</i>	40,2% (49)	19,4% (13)
Use in-house provider (only or partly)	69,7% (85)	67,2% (45)
<i>Only use in-house provider</i>	26,2% (32)	47,8% (32)
<i>Partly use in-house provider</i>	43,4% (53)	19,4% (13)
Other type of provision *	50,0% (61)	13,4% (9)
<i>Only use other type of provision</i>	3,3% (4)	7,5% (5)
<i>Partly use other type of provision</i>	46,7% (57)	6,0% (4)

N =122 (Parks), N = 67 (Roads).

Data is based on categorical questions (yes / no / don't know) on whether the Local Authority used different types of providers for park and/or road maintenance services.

* 'Other type of provision' include: 'Public / private joint venture', 'local social enterprise', 'other government organisation', 'national or third sector organisation', 'community groups', and 'other (not specified in survey)'.

Survey Item: Q3a

The use of providers other than private contractor and in-house providers for provision of parks maintenance services.

Table 13 provides an overview of English Local Authorities' use of provider types other than private contractors and in-house providers for park maintenance services. 46.7% of English Local Authorities partly use provision types other than private contractor and in-house providers. Of the 61 Local Authorities that use other types of provision, the most common provider type is 'community groups' (83.6%) while 'other government organisation' is the least favoured other provider type (4.9%).

Table 13 the use of other types of providers of parks maintenance services (only or partly)

Type of provider	Frequencies
Public / private joint venture	11.5% (7)
Local social enterprise	13.1% (8)
Other government organisation	4.9% (3)
National or third sector organisation	41.0% (25)
Community groups	83.6% (51)
Other (not specified in survey)	11.5% (7)

N = 61

Data is based on categorical questions (yes / no / don't know) on whether the Local Authority used different types of providers for park and/or road maintenance services.

Survey Item: Q3b

Distribution (un-weighted) of parks and roads maintenance budgets between provider types

Table 14 provides an overview of the current distribution of parks and roads maintenance budgets between different types of service providers. The (un-weighted) average allocation of maintenance budget for private contractors is 34.8% for parks and 32.2% for roads.

Table 14
Current distribution (un-weighted) of parks and roads maintenance budgets between different types of service providers

Statistics*	Parks			Roads		
	Private contractors	In-house provider	Other type of provider**	Private contractors	In-house provider	Other type of provider**
N	120	120	120	68	68	68
Mean	34.8%	58.2%	7.1%	32.3%	58.3%	9.4%
S.D.	43.4%	45.3%	20.1%	44.3%	47.1%	28.1%
Median	5%	88.5%	0%	0%	93.5%	0%
Low value	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
High Value	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

N= 120 for parks and 68 for roads.

The table reports the current distribution of maintenance budgets on different types of providers.

Data is based on self-reported estimates based on the size of budgets distributed for different arrangements.

** 'other type of provider includes: 'public / private joint venture', 'local social enterprise', 'other government organisation', 'national or local third sector organisation', 'community groups' and 'other (not specified in survey)'.

Survey Item: Q3a

Purposes for using private contractors and in-house providers

Table 15 provides an overview on the importance of altogether nine different purposes for using private contractors for provision of maintenance services for parks and roads. Purposes are measured on a response scale from 0 to 10 where 0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘very high degree’.

The highest ranked purposes are ‘*cost effective maintenance*’ (mean = 7.7) and ‘*high maintenance quality*’ (mean = 6.3) while ‘*develop internal organisation and work routines*’ (mean = 4.1) and ‘*develop and renew areas and services*’ are the lowest ranked. In general, there is a high variation among the Local Authorities in the importance of the various purposes for using private contractors. The variation is smallest for ‘*cost effective maintenance*’ (S.D. = 2.2) and highest for ‘*provide work the Local Authority cannot do*’ (S.D. = 3.8).

Table 15
Purposes for using private contractors (parks and roads)

Purpose*	N	Mean	S.D.
<i>High maintenance quality</i>	52	6,3	2,8
<i>Cost effective maintenance</i>	51	7,7	2,2
<i>To ensure flexible maintenance</i>	51	6,1	2,6
<i>Test and benchmark prices</i>	51	6,2	2,7
<i>Provide work the Local Authority cannot do</i>	50	5,7	3,8
<i>Develop and renew areas and services</i>	50	4,6	3,3
<i>Develop internal organisation and work routines</i>	49	4,1	3,1
<i>Address changing budget pressures</i>	50	6,2	3,2
<i>To focus on strategic management (instead of day to day maintenance)</i>	50	4,9	3,4

N = 49 (listwise)

The table reports about the purposes for using private contractors in both departments of parks and roads.

Data is based on responses on the degree the respondent finds various purposes a key part of the Local Authority's rationale for using private contractors for parks and road maintenance services.

All items measured by an 11-point response-scale with anchors (0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘Very high degree’).

Survey item: Q7a

Table 16 provides an overview on the importance of altogether ten different purposes for using in-house provision for maintenance of parks and roads. Purposes are measured on a response scale from 0 to 10 where 0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘very high degree’.

The highest ranked purposes are ‘*to ensure flexible maintenance*’ (mean = 9.1) and ‘*high quality maintenance*’ (mean = 8.4) while ‘*to focus on strategic management*’ (mean = 4.7) and ‘*provide work others cannot do*’ (mean = 5.5) are the lowest ranked. The variation in the importance of the various purposes for using in-house provision differs to some degree between the various purposes. The variation between the Local Authorities is smallest for ‘*to ensure flexible maintenance*’ (S.D. = 1.4) while ‘*provide work others cannot do*’ (S.D. = 3.3) and ‘*to focus on strategic management*’ (S.D. = 3.3) have the highest variation.

Table 16.
Purposes for using in-house provision (parks and roads)

Purpose*	N	Mean	S.D.
<i>High quality maintenance</i>	70	8,4	1,6
<i>Cost effective maintenance</i>	70	8,2	1,7
<i>To ensure flexible maintenance</i>	70	9,1	1,4
<i>Provide work others cannot do</i>	68	5,5	3,3
<i>Develop and renew areas and services</i>	67	7,0	2,7
<i>Develop internal organisation and work routines</i>	69	7,5	2,5
<i>Address changing budget pressures</i>	69	8,0	2,7
<i>To focus on strategic management (instead of day to day maintenance)</i>	69	4,7	3,3
<i>Ensure capacity to carry out maintenance ('supply safety')</i>	67	7,3	2,3
<i>Preserve local jobs</i>	57	6,6	3,2

N = 57 (listwise)

The table reports about the purposes for using in-house provision in case of both parks and roads.

Data is based on responses on the degree the respondent finds various purposes a key part of the Local Authority's rationale for using in-house provision for parks and road maintenance services.

All items measured by an 11-point response-scale with anchors (0 = 'not at all' and 10 = 'Very high degree').

Survey item: Q22a

Political and administrative support

Table 17 provides an overview of degree of political and administrative support for contracting out and debates about contracting out in the Local Authorities. The degree of debate and support is measured on a response scale from 0 to 10 where 0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘very high degree’.

The mean score for political aim to contract out (5.0) is slightly lower than the mean score for the administrative aim to contract out (5.6). The degree of continued debates about contracting out is scored slightly lower for the political level (mean = 3.2) compared to the administrative level (mean = 3.7).

Table 17
Political and administrative support for contracting out

Dimension	N	Mean	S.D
Political aim to contracting out	47	5,0	3,5
Administrative aim to contracting out	49	5,6	3,1
Continued political debates about contracting out	48	3,2	3,4
Continued administrative debates about contracting out	50	3,7	3,4

N = 47 (listwise)

The table reports about the political and administrative support for contracting out.

All items measured by an 11-point response-scale with anchors (0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘Very high degree’).

Survey Item: Q8a

Table 18 provides an overview of degree of political and administrative support for in-house provision and debates about in-house provision in the Local Authorities. The degree of debate and support is measured on a response scale from 0 to 10 where 0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘very high degree’.

The mean score for political aim to use in-house provision (7.8) is slightly higher than the mean score for the administrative aim to use in-house provision (7.5). The degree of continued debates about the use of in-house provision is scored slightly lower for the political level (mean = 3.6) compared to the administrative level (mean = 3.8).

Table 18.
Political and administrative support for in-house provision

Dimension	N	Mean	S.D
Political aim in the Local Authority	65	7,8	2,5
Administrative aim in the Local Authority	61	7,5	2,4
Continued political debates in the Local Authority	64	3,6	3,3
Continued administrative debates in the Local Authority	63	3,8	3,3

N = 65

The table reports about the political and administrative support for in-house provision.

All items measured by an 11-point response-scale with anchors (0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘Very high degree’).

Survey item: Q23a

MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATION

Summary

This section provides data and statistics on the management and organization of the provision of park and road maintenance services.

Measured on a scale from 0 (not at all) to 10 (very high degree) the most important features of formal contract relations between park and road departments in English Local Authorities and private contractors are '*formal legal clauses*' (mean score = 8.8) and '*performance specifications*' (mean score = 7.7). The two least important features are '*financial incentives*' (mean score = 2.8) and '*requirements for delivering local benefits*' (mean score = 4.5).

Measured on a scale from 0 (not at all) to 10 (very high degree) the most important features in the management approach toward private contractors are '*use of face-to-face meetings and communications*' (mean score = 8.4) as well as '*focus on fulfilment of strategic and long-term aims*' (mean score = 7.8) and '*focus on compliance to formal operational specifications*' (mean score = 7.0). '*Adherence to 'hard' sanctions for noncompliance*' is the least important feature in the management approach (mean score = 5.0).

The mutual institutionalization of behavioural norms in relations between Local Authorities and private contractors providing park and road maintenance services (measured on a scale from 0 = 'not at all' to 10 = 'very high degree') is strongest for norms related to the necessity of *collaboration*' (mean score = 8.3), '*mutuality*' (mean score = 7.4) and '*flexibility*' (mean score = 7.5). The institutionalization is weakest for norms related to '*trust*' (mean score = 5.5). While the institutionalization of norms for collaboration and flexibility varies in minor degrees (respectively, S.D. = 1.9 and 2.0) between the Local Authorities, the norms related to trust varies to a greater extent (S.D. = 3.4).

In the formal organisation of management of in-house providers, the most two most frequently used instruments are: '*separation of client / procurement and delivery responsibilities*' (90.3% of all Local Authorities) and '*in-house teams able to offer services to other clients*' (90.3% of all Local Authorities). '*Independent budget and annual accounts*' is also commonly used (67.6% of all Local Authorities). The two least frequently used instruments are '*independent monitoring / inspection of maintenance*' (23.2% of all Local Authorities) and '*separation of client / procurement and delivery responsibilities*' (26.1% of all Local Authorities).

The degree of separation of in-house provision, i.e. internally organized maintenance operations, from other responsibilities within local park and road sector (measured on a scale from 0 = 'not at all' to 10 = 'very high degree') is highest for responsibilities regarding '*administration and authority / legal tasks*' (mean scores = 5.4 for both parks and roads) and '*general maintenance planning*' (mean score = 5.0 for both parks and roads). The degree of separation is lowest for '*general planning, strategy and development*' (mean scores = 4.8 for parks and 4.2 for roads). It is worth noting that all categories regarding organizational and managerial separation have mean scores very close to each other (ranging from 4.2 to 5.4).

The mutual institutionalization of behavioural norms in relations within the Local Authorities toward the departments with responsibility for in-house provision of park and road maintenance services (measured on a scale from 0 = 'not at all' to 10 = 'very high degree') is strongest for norms related to the necessity of '*collaboration*' (mean score = 8.4) and norms related to '*lack of opportunism*' (mean score = 8.3). The institutionalization is weakest for norms related to '*trust*' (mean score = 6.4). While the institutionalization of norms for collaboration and lack of opportunism varies in lesser to moderate degrees (respectively, S.D. = 2.0 and 2.2) between the Local Authorities, the norms related to trust varies to a larger extent (S.D = 3.7).

Park maintenance services provided by private contractors and in-house providers are found to be approximately equally as '*difficult to monitor*' (respectively 32.9% and 32.2%). Park maintenance services are approximately as '*easy to describe clearly and unambiguously*' for both private contractors and in-house providers as well (respectively 67.3% and 63.0%). The respondents have indicated that road maintenance services provided by private contractors are slightly more '*difficult to monitor*' (28.6%) than those provided by in-house providers (20.0%). Road maintenance services are approximately as '*easy to describe clearly and unambiguously*' for both private contractors and in-house providers (respectively 63.6% and 59.0%). For all categories regarding services provided by private contractors there are relatively high variations (S.D. ranging from 25.8 to 33.2) and the same can be said for services provided by in-house providers (S.D. ranging from 21.0 to 34.8).

Formal management of private providers

Table 19 provides an overview of the importance of eight possible formal contract dimensions for managing and organizing provision of park and road maintenance services by private contractors. All dimensions are measured on a response scale from 0 to 10 where 0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘very high degree’.

The two highest scored formal dimensions are ‘*formal legal clauses*’ (mean score = 8.8) and ‘*performance specifications*’ (mean score = 7.7). The two lowest scored formal dimensions are ‘*financial incentives*’ (mean score = 2.8) and ‘*requirements for delivering local benefits*’ (mean score = 4.5).

Table 19.
Formal contract dimensions for managing and organizing provision of park and road maintenance services by private contractors

Importance of formal dimension*	Descriptive statistics		
	N	Mean	S.D.
<i>Formal legal clauses.</i>	57	8.8	1.8
<i>Performance specifications - describing overall goals, functionality and guidelines for operation and development.</i>	57	7.7	2.6
<i>Prescriptive specifications - based on quantities, instructions and performance measures.</i>	57	7.5	2.8
<i>Formal sanctions for noncompliance.</i>	55	5.8	3.3
<i>Collaborative working between contractor and client.</i>	55	7.1	2.8
<i>Requirements for contractors to involve or liaise with users / community.</i>	56	5.6	3.3
<i>Financial incentives.</i>	54	2.8	3.2
<i>Competence requirements.</i>	55	7.0	2.8
<i>Requirements for delivering local benefits.</i>	56	4.5	3.6

N=57

The table reports about the contract dimensions for managing and organizing provision of park and road maintenance services by private contractors.

* All items measured on a scale from 0 to 10 (0 = ‘not at all’, 10 = ‘very high degree’) on the question. “On a scale from 0 to 10, please indicate in which degree the following content is a central part of your department’s arrangements with private contractors”.

Survey item: Q15a.

Formal management of in-house providers

Table 20 provides an overview of the frequencies of English Local Authorities' use of seven possible formal instruments for managing and organizing in-house providers of road and park maintenance services.

The two most widespread instruments among the Local Authorities are '*separation of client / procurement and delivery responsibilities*' (90.3% of all Local Authorities) and '*in-house teams able to offer services to other clients*' (90.3% of all Local Authorities). The two least frequently used instruments are: '*independent monitoring / inspection of maintenance*' (23.2% of all Local Authorities) and '*separation of client / procurement and delivery responsibilities*' (26.1% of all Local Authorities). '*Independent budget and annual accounts*' is also a commonly used instrument (67.6% of all Local Authorities).

Table 20.
Formal instruments for managing and organizing in-house providers

Formal instruments (Local Authority parks and roads service providers)*	Frequencies (relative / absolute)**					
	Yes		No		Don't know / no answer	
Business planning.	90.3%	65	5.6%	4	4.2%	3
Separation of client / procurement and delivery responsibilities.	26.1%	18	71.0%	49	2.9%	2
Independent budget and annual accounts.	67.6%	48	28.2%	20	4.2%	3
Independent management.	45.7%	32	48.6%	34	5.7%	4
Independent monitoring / inspection of maintenance.	23.2%	16	76.8%	53	0%	0
Work carried out in-house is subject to competitive tendering.	47.9%	34	50.7%	36	1.4%	1
In-house teams able to offer services to other clients.	90.3%	65	9.7%	7	0%	0

N = 72

* The table shows the distribution of answers ('yes', 'no' and 'don't know') for seven key management tools on the question: "Which of the following does the Local Authority use in its management and organisation of in-house maintenance of parks and green spaces and/or streetscene?"

** The relative frequencies count the share of the group of Local Authorities with in-house providers that use a particular management tool.

Survey item: Q20a

Size of park and road maintenance budgets

Based on survey data Table 21 shows the average size of total budgets (in mill. £) for maintenance of parks and roads at department level.

The average size of maintenance budgets for parks departments is indicated to be around 3.3 mill. £/year and 5.5 mill. £/year for road departments. On average, the budgets at the department level for road maintenance are 1.7 times as high as the average budgets for park maintenance.

Table 21.
Size of park and road maintenance budgets for departments* (mill. £)

	Parks - Maintenance budgets	Roads - Maintenance budgets
N	74	34
Mean	3.3	5.5
S.D.	4.7	17.1

The table shows the average size of total maintenance budgets for parks and roads at department level.

**Department refers to the department's maintenance budgets for parks or roads where the respondent is employed.*

Survey item: Q36a & Q36b

Management approach and relations to providers

Table 22 shows the average degree in which four important management instruments characterize English Local Authorities' management of private contractors providing park and road maintenance services. Characteristics are measured on an 11-point scale from 0 to 10 with anchors (0 = not at all, 10 = very high degree).

The most important features in the management approach toward private contractors are '*use of face-to-face meetings and communications*' (mean score = 8.4) as well as '*focus on fulfilment of strategic and long-term aims*' (mean score = 7.8) and '*focus on compliance to formal operational specifications*' (mean score = 7.0). '*Adherence to 'hard' sanctions for noncompliance*' is a less important feature in the management approach (mean score = 5.0).

Table 22.
Characteristics of English Local Authorities' management of private contractors

Management instrument	N	Mean	S.D.
<i>Adherence to 'hard' sanctions for noncompliance</i>	56	5.0	3.0
<i>Use of face-to-face meetings / communications</i>	56	8.4	1.8
<i>Focus on compliance to formal operational specifications</i>	56	7.0	1.9
<i>Focus on fulfilment of strategic and long-term aims</i>	56	7.8	2.0

N = 56

The table shows the degree in which various management instruments characterize English Local Authorities' management of private contractors providing park and road maintenance.

** All items measured on an 11-point response scale with anchors (0 = 'not at all' and 10 = 'very high degree') for four questions regarding the degree various management instruments characterize the Local Authority's management of private contractors providing park and road maintenance.*

Survey Item: Q11a

Table 23 shows the average degree in which four important management instruments characterize English Local Authorities' management of the in-house provision of park and road maintenance services. Characteristics are measured on an 11-point scale from 0 to 10 with anchors (0 = not at all, 10 = very high degree).

The most important features in the management approach toward in-house providers are '*focus on fulfilment of strategic and long-term aims*' (mean score = 8.0) as well as '*use of face-to-face meetings / communications*' (mean score = 7.6) and '*focus on compliance to formal operational specifications*' (mean score = 6.5). '*Adherence to 'hard' sanctions for noncompliance*' is a less important feature in the management approach (mean score = 1.5).

Table 23.
Management of in-house provider

Management dimension	N	Mean	S.D.
<i>Adherence to 'hard' sanctions for noncompliance</i>	50	1.5	2.4
<i>Use of face-to-face meetings / communications</i>	61	7.6	2.5
<i>Focus on compliance to formal operational specifications</i>	61	6.5	2.8
<i>Focus on fulfilment of strategic and long-term aims</i>	61	8.0	1.8

N = 61

The table shows the degree in which various management instruments characterize English Local Authorities' management of in-house provision of park and road maintenance.

** All items measured on an 11-point response scale with anchors (0 = 'not at all' and 10 = 'very high degree') for four questions regarding the degree various management instruments characterize the Local Authority's management of in-house provision of park and road maintenance.*

Survey item: Q27a

Table 24 shows the degree in which contract management capacity for managing private contractors is evaluated as sufficient. The degree of sufficiency is measured on an 11-point scale from 0 to 10 with anchors (0 = not at all, 10 = very high degree).

The table shows that, on the average, '*knowledge and experience*', '*methods and systems*' and '*managerial routines and procedures*' are evaluated sufficient in relatively high degrees (mean scores between 7.0 and 8.0) while '*organisational resources*' are evaluated as less sufficient by a relatively lower mean score (5.7).

Table 24.
Contract management capacity for managing private contractors

Dimension of capacity*	N	Mean	S.D.
<i>Sufficient organisational resources (time and staff)</i>	55	5.7	2.6
<i>Sufficient knowledge and experience</i>	55	8.0	1.9
<i>Sufficient methods and systems (GIS and ICT)</i>	55	7.0	1.9
<i>Sufficient managerial routines and procedures</i>	55	7.5	1.5

N = 55

The table shows average scores for the evaluation of the degree in which the contract management capacity for managing private contractors is sufficient.

* All items measured by an 11-point response-scale with anchors (0 = 'not at all' and 10 = 'Very high degree').

Survey item: Q12a

Organizational and managerial separation of in-house provision of maintenance

Table 25 shows the degrees in which the in-house service provision of park and road maintenance at the operational level are organizationally and managerially separated from other responsibilities related to park and road services. The degree of separation is measured on an 11-point scale from 0 to 10 with anchors (0 = not at all, 10 = very high degree).

All categories have mean scores relatively close to each other (between 4.2 and 5.4). For both park and road services the separation is most profound for tasks related to ‘administration and authority / legal tasks’, ‘general maintenance planning’, ‘site development’ as well as ‘monitoring of maintenance’. The separation is less profound for tasks related to ‘general planning, strategy and development’ and ‘general planning and administration of budgets’. The variations among Local Authorities in the separation measured by standard deviations are very high for all types of responsibilities (S.D. ranging from 3.6 to 4.5).

Table 25.
The degree of organizational and managerial separation of in-house provision of maintenance

Degree of separation of in-house provision of maintenance from ... *	Parks			Roads		
	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.
<i>General planning, strategy and development</i>	65	4.8	3.6	31	4.2	3.7
<i>Administration and authority / legal tasks</i>	67	5.4	3.9	33	5.4	4.0
<i>General maintenance planning**</i>	69	5.0	4.0	32	5.0	4.4
<i>Monitoring of maintenance (besides self-monitoring)</i>	69	4.9	4.4	32	5.0	4.5
<i>General planning and administration of budgets</i>	68	4.9	4.5	30	4.6	4.4
<i>Site development***</i>	69	5.0	3.7	32	4.9	3.9

N = 69 (Parks), *N* = 33 (Roads).

The table shows the degree of organizational and managerial separation of in-house provision of maintenance from other responsibilities related to park and road services.

** All items measured on an 11-point scale from 0 to 10 with anchors (0 = not at all, 10 = very high degree).*

*** General maintenance planning includes: procurement of services, management plans and quality descriptions.*

**** Site development includes: Project development, site activation / events and community engagement.*

Survey Item: Q22a & Q21c

Transactional characteristics of park and road maintenance services

Table 26 shows the evaluation of general transactional characteristics of maintenance services provided by private contractors.

Approximately two-thirds of park and road parks maintenance services provided by private contractors are evaluated as '*easy to describe clearly and unambiguously*'. 33.6% of park maintenance and 25.7% of road maintenance is evaluated as '*difficult to provide without joint planning and communication*' while 32.9% of park maintenance and 28.6% of road maintenance are evaluated as '*difficult to monitor*'.

Table 26.
General transactional characteristics of maintenance services provided by private contractors

The percentage of services that are:	Parks			Roads		
	Difficult to monitor	Difficult to provide without joint planning and communication	Easy to describe clearly and unambiguously	Difficult to monitor	Difficult to provide without joint planning and communication	Easy to describe clearly and unambiguously
N	48	47	48	22	21	22
Mean	32.9%	33.6%	67.3%	28.6%	25.7%	63.6%
S.D.	28.3%	26.9%	29.5%	28.0%	25.8%	33.2%

N = 48 (Parks) N = 22 (Roads)

The table shows the general transactional characteristics of park and road maintenance services provided by private contractors.

** The table reports the percentage of services (provided by private contractors) which are difficult to monitor, difficult to provide without joint planning and communication, and easy to describe clearly and unambiguously.*

Survey item: Q14a & Q14b

Table 27 shows the evaluation of general transactional characteristics of maintenance services provided in-house.

63.0% of park maintenance and 59.0% of road maintenance provided in-house are evaluated as '*easy to describe clearly and unambiguously*'. 30.0% of park maintenance and 23.9% of road maintenance is evaluated as '*difficult to provide without joint planning and communication*'. 32.2% of park maintenance and 20.0% of road maintenance is evaluated as '*difficult to monitor*'.

Table 27.
General transactional characteristics of maintenance services provided in-house

The percentage of services that are*:	Parks			Roads		
	Difficult to monitor	Difficult to provide without joint planning and communication	Easy to describe clearly and unambiguously	Difficult to monitor	Difficult to provide without joint planning and communication	Easy to describe clearly and unambiguously
N	60	57	61	28	28	28
Mean	32.2%	30.0%	63.0%	20.0%	23.9%	59.0%
S.D.	29.5%	30.2%	28.8%	21.0%	25.0%	34.8%

N = 61 (Parks) N = 29 (Roads)

The table shows the general transactional characteristics of park and road maintenance services provided in-house.

* The table reports the percentage of services (provided in-house) that are difficult to monitor, difficult to provide without joint planning and communication, and easy to describe clearly and unambiguously.

Survey item: Q28a & Q28b

Mutual institutionalization of behavioural norms

Table 28 shows the mutual institutionalization of six behavioural norms in relations between Local Authorities and private contractors providing park and road maintenance services. The behavioural norms are operationalized by altogether six different items which measure the presence of norms in favour of ‘collaboration’, ‘mutuality’, ‘flexibility’, ‘lack of opportunism’, ‘trust’, and ‘solidarity’ in the relation. The degree of institutionalization is measured on an 11-point response scale where 0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘very high degree’.

The evaluation shows that ‘collaboration’ (mean score = 8.3), ‘mutuality’ (mean score = 7.4) and ‘flexibility’ (mean score = 7.5) characterise the relations with private contractor in relatively high degrees while ‘trust’ (mean score = 5.5) characterize the relations in a lower degree although the variation among Local Authorities for ‘trust’ is relatively high (S.D. = 3.4).

Table 28.
The degree of institutionalization of behavioural norms in relations with private contractors

Dimension of behavioural norms*	N	Mean	S.D.
<i>Collaboration</i>	57	8.3	1.9
<i>Mutuality</i>	57	7.4	1.8
<i>Flexibility</i>	67	7.4	2.0
<i>Lack of opportunism</i>	55	7.2	2.7
<i>Trust</i>	56	5.5	3.4
<i>Solidarity</i>	56	6.7	2.7

N = 57

The table shows the degree of institutionalization of six behavioural norms in relations with private contractors.

Data is based on responses to the degree whether the following survey items characterize the relation(s) with private contractors: “We are both of the opinion that it is necessary to co-operate in order for each of us to attain our goals”, “we are both concerned with the other party attaining their goals”, “we are both prepared to make operational changes if it makes the work easier for one of the parties”, “Neither of us would exploit a weakness or error made by the other for our own benefit”, “we both think it is OK to owe each other a favour” and “regardless of who bears the responsibility for an error, we think that the solution to the problem is a joint responsibility”.

* All items measured by a specific question on an 11-point response scale with anchors (0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘very high degree’).

Survey item: Q10a

Table 29 shows the institutionalization of behavioural norms of relations within the Local Authority toward the department with responsibility for in-house provision of park and road maintenance services. The degree of institutionalization is measured on an 11-point response scale where 0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘very high degree’.

The relational quality is operationalized by altogether six different items which measure the presence of norms in favour of ‘*collaboration*’, ‘*mutuality*’, ‘*flexibility*’, ‘*lack of opportunism*’, ‘*trust*’, and ‘*solidarity*’ in the relation. The evaluation shows that ‘*collaboration*’ (mean score = 8.4), ‘*lack of opportunism*’ (mean score = 8.3), ‘*mutuality*’ (mean score = 8.0), ‘*solidarity*’ (mean score = 8.0) and ‘*flexibility*’ (mean score = 7.9) characterise the relations with in-house providers in relatively high degrees. ‘*Trust*’ gets the lowest score (mean score = 6.4) among the six items and has the highest variation among Local Authorities (S.D. = 3.7).

Table 29.
The degree of institutionalization of behavioural norms in the internal relations with an in-house provider

Dimension of behavioural norms*	N	Mean	S.D.
<i>Collaboration</i>	63	8.4	2.0
<i>Mutuality</i>	59	8.0	2.0
<i>Flexibility</i>	61	7.9	2.3
<i>Lack of opportunism</i>	60	8.3	2.2
<i>Trust</i>	58	6.4	3.7
<i>Solidarity</i>	57	8.0	2.3

N = 63

The table shows the degree of institutionalization of six behavioural norms in the Local Authorities’ internal relations with an in-house provider.

Data is based on responses to the degree whether the following survey items characterize the relation(s) with private contractors: “We are both of the opinion that it is necessary to co-operate in order for each of us to attain our goals”, “we are both concerned with the other party attaining their goals”, “we are both prepared to make operational changes if it makes the work easier for one of the parties”, “Neither of us would exploit a weakness or error made by the other for our own benefit”, “we both think it is OK to owe each other a favour” and “regardless of who bears the responsibility for an error, we think that the solution to the problem is a joint responsibility”.

* All items measured on an 11-point response scale with anchors (0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘very high degree’).

Survey item: Q26a

Organizational change and economic pressure

Table 30 shows the degree of experienced (past five years) and expected (next five years) internal organizational changes. The degree of internal organizational change is measured on an 11-point response scale where 0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘very high degree’.

On average, the degree of past change is evaluated lower (mean = 6.7) than future change (7.6). The variation among the Local Authorities in experienced organizational change is relatively high (mean = 2.7) while the variation for expected change is slightly lower (mean = 2.0).

Table 30.
Experienced and expected organizational change

Dimension*	N	Mean	S.D.
<i>Experienced changes in organization and responsibilities in past five years</i>	85	6.7	2.7
<i>Expected changes in organization and responsibilities in the next five years</i>	82	7.6	2.0

N=57

The table shows the average degree of experienced and expected organizational change in English Local Authorities' park and road departments.

* All items measured on an 11-point response scale with anchors (0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘very high degree’).

Survey item: Q35.

Table 31 shows the Local Authorities' estimated change in budget for maintenance of parks and roads over the last five years.

On average, the budget is estimated to have decreased over the last five years for both parks and roads maintenance (mean = -15.5% and -11.5%). The variation among Local Authorities in experienced budget change is relatively high for both parks and roads maintenance (S.D. = 18.3% and 17.8%).

Table 31.
Experienced budget pressure.

Change in budget since 2010 N=					Estimation N= 76 (Parks) 21 (Roads)	
Budget Change	Stayed the same	Increased	Decreased	Don't know	Change by approx.	
					Mean	S.D.
Parks	13	56	7	6	-15.5%	18.3%
Roads	10	4	17	4	-11.5%	17.8%

N = 82 (Parks) N = 25 (Roads)

The table shows the average change in total maintenance budgets for parks and roads at department level.

**The table reports the change in total maintenance budget based on estimates of the respondents.*

Survey item: Q36a & Q36b

PROCUREMENT, MARKETS AND CONTRACTS

Summary

This section provides data and statistics on procurement, markets and contracts related to the maintenance of parks and roads among Local Authorities in the UK.

In relation to procurement of park and road maintenance in the UK, there is a significant relation between cost and quality of maintenance ($p < .01$). For the 26 cases which indicated a decrease in quality, all but one also indicated that cost had decreased as a result from the last procurement round.

Measured on a scale from 0 (not at all) to 10 (very high degree) the most considerable risks / barriers for using private contractors for provision of park and road maintenance are '*contractor submitting unrealistic costs leading to poor delivery*' (mean = 5.4) and '*contractor making unjustified assumptions / expectations leading to issues with delivery*' (mean = 5.2). The least substantial risk / barrier for using private contractors is '*legal issues / disputes resulting in issues with delivery*' (mean = 3.0). On average, Local Authorities in the UK face low to moderate risks and barriers for using private contractors (means ranging from 3.0 to 5.4).

Departments of Local Authorities in the UK have in case of maintenance of both parks and roads indicated that their department only operate with a single contract with a private contractor (48.5% for parks and 66.7% for roads). Sixteen departments have indicated that they have a 'bundled' contract which encompass both park and road maintenance services.

15 Local Authorities have indicated that they operate with an ordinary contract period of five years for park maintenance, which is the most common contract period among all Local Authorities in the UK. The most common extension period for park maintenance contracts is between one and three years (in 19 cases). For road maintenance the most common ordinary contract period is seven years (in 6 cases) and the most common extension period is between four and seven years (in 9 cases). It is noteworthy that only 22 out of 122 Local Authorities in the UK provided information about road maintenance contract length.

The average contract length for roads (7.3 years) is almost two years longer than the average contract length for parks (5.5 years). The average period for optional extension is a year longer for roads (4.9 years) compared to parks (3.9 years). The variation in contract

length and extension length is relatively high for both parks and roads (S.D. ranging from 3.8 to 7.2).

Procurement and markets

The UK survey included a unique item about the change in quality in conjunction with change in cost as a result from last round of procurement. Table 32 shows the distribution of cost and quality effects among all 66 cases in UK. Most notable is the (almost singular) association between the indications of decreased quality with a cost decrease (26 cases). All but one case which indicated a quality decrease also indicated that cost had decreased as a result from the last procurement round. It should be noted that the indication of changes in quality do not necessarily equal a change in the managers' *satisfaction* with maintenance quality. Overall, analysis of the data in Table 18 indicates that changes in cost levels are significantly ($p < .01$) associated with changes in quality levels. In particular decrease in quality levels are significantly correlated with a decrease in cost levels.

Table 32.
Procurement of park and road maintenance in UK: Cost and quality effects

Treatment of pain and feed management in SW 666 and quality effects							
Cost effect ^a	Quality effect ^a						Total
	Increased (observed / expected)		No change (observed / expected)		Decreased (observed / expected)		
Decrease	14	(13.1)	11	(17.0)	26	(20.9)	51
No change	2	(2.6)	8	(3.3)	0	(4.1)	10
Increase	1	(1.3)	3	(1.7)	1	(2.0)	5
Total	17		22		27		66

^a Data based on self-reported impacts on cost and quality levels from the last round of procurement of park and road maintenance services.

Test statistics for relationship between variables (6 cells has an expected count < 5, minimum expected count = 1.3): Fisher's exact test: 15.512, $p = .001$ (two-sided). Null hypothesis (no association) rejected. Cramer's $V = .347$. Similar results are found by ordinary chi-test.

Survey item: Q16a & Q16b

Table 33 shows English Local Authorities' evaluation of the degree of risks / barriers for using private contractors for provision of park and road maintenance. The degree of risks / barriers is measured by an 11-point response-scale with anchors where 0 = 'not at all' and 10 = 'very high degree'.

The degree of risks / barriers is measured by nine different items. Mean scores for all nine items are low to moderate (ranging from 3.0 to 5.4). However, the variation among Local Authorities in the degree of risks / barriers is relatively high (S.D. ranging from 2.9 to 3.3). The table shows that on average English Local Authorities face low to moderate risks and barriers with using private contractors for provision of park and road maintenance.

Table 33.
Risks and barriers for using private contractors (parks and roads)

Issues and barriers to using private contractors	N	Mean	S.D.
<i>Getting enough contractors to submit tenders</i>	52	4.1	3.2
<i>Contractor submitting unrealistic costs leading to poor delivery</i>	53	5.4	3.2
<i>Contractor making unjustified assumptions / expectations leading to issues with delivery</i>	52	5.2	3.2
<i>Contractors employing poorly qualified / inexperienced staff leading to issues with delivery</i>	54	3.2	2.9
<i>Termination of contract or other issues due to contractor's financial situation</i>	52	3.2	2.9
<i>Policy / legislation preventing the best possible contractor or contractual arrangement being secured</i>	51	3.8	3.3
<i>Policy / legislation preventing more collaborative working with the contractor</i>	50	3.2	2.9
<i>Legal issues / disputes resulting in issues with delivery</i>	52	3.0	2.9
<i>Personal knowledge of policy / legislation / contract or procurement options</i>	52	3.2	3.0

N = 54

The table shows the level of risks and barriers with using private contractors of provision of road and park maintenance services.

* All items measured by an 11-point response-scale with anchors (0 = 'not at all' and 10 = 'very high degree').

Survey item: Q18

Contracts

Table 34 shows the number of contracts park and road departments in English Local Authorities have with private contractors. In case of both parks and roads a large part of the departments indicates that their department have only one contract with a private contractor (48.5% for parks and 66.7% for roads). Sixteen of the departments indicated that they have a 'bundled' contract which encompass both park and road maintenance services.

Table 34.
Number of contracts with private contractors

Number of contracts	Parks		Roads	
	Absolute	Relative	Absolute	Relative
<i>No contracts</i>	9	13.6%	4	12.1%
<i>One contract</i>	32	48.5%	22	66.7%
<i>Two contracts</i>	10	15.2%	2	6.1%
<i>Three contracts</i>	6	9.1%	2	6.1%
<i>Four contracts or more</i>	9	13.6%	3	9.1%
Total N (with data provided)*	66	100%	33	100%

N = 66 (Parks), N = 33 (Roads)

The table shows how many contracts road and park departments in English Local Authorities have with private contractors.

** Altogether sixteen Local Authorities indicated use of 'bundled contracts' comprising provision of both road and park maintenance by a single private contractor.*

Survey item: Q5a, Q5b & Q5c.

Table 35 shows the distribution of ordinary contract period and the optional extension period for park maintenance contracts. The most common ordinary contract period is five years (in 15 cases) and the most common extension period is between one and three years (in 19 cases).

Table 35.
Contract period for park maintenance contracts

Length (in years) *	Ordinary contract (N)	Option for extension (N)					Total (N)
		No option	1-3 years	4-7 years	Ten or more years	No data	
<i>Less than a year</i>	2	0	0	0	0	2	2
<i>One</i>	8	3	3	0	0	2	8
<i>Three</i>	3	0	3	0	0	0	3
<i>Four</i>	3	0	3	0	0	0	3
<i>Five</i>	15	1	7	5	1	1	15
<i>Six</i>	3	0	2	1	0	0	3
<i>Seven</i>	8	0	0	7 **	0	1	8
<i>Seven and a half</i>	1	0	0	1	0	0	1
<i>Eight</i>	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
<i>Ten or more ***</i>	7	2	1	1	2	1	7
Total	51	6	19	15	3	8	51

N = 51

The table reports the contract period for park maintenance contracts

** Data on contract length for park maintenance contracts were provided for 51 Local Authorities out of 67 Local Authorities indicating a use of private contractors for provision of park maintenance.*

*** Out of 8 Local Authorities that normally use an ordinary contract length of 7 years, 7 responded that they operate with an option for a 7-year extension as well.*

**** Local Authorities with contract lengths that fall in the category of 'ten or more years' normally operate with ordinary contract lengths of up to 28 years.*

Survey item: Q6a

Table 36 shows the distribution of ordinary contract period according to number of years and the optional extension period for road maintenance contracts. The most common ordinary contract period is seven years (in 6 cases) and the most common extension period is between four and seven years (in 9 cases).

Table 36
Contract period for road maintenance contracts

Length (in years) *	Ordinary contract (N)	Option for extension (N)					Total (N)
		No option	1-3 years	4-7 years	Ten or more years	No data	
<i>Less than a year</i>	3	3	0	0	0	0	3
<i>One</i>	2	0	0	0	0	2	2
<i>Two</i>	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
<i>Five</i>	3	0	1	1	1	0	3
<i>Six</i>	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
<i>Seven</i>	6	0	0	5**	0	1	6
<i>Seven and a half</i>	1	0	0	1	0	0	1
<i>Ten or more***</i>	5	1	0	2	1	1	5
Total	22	4	3	9	2	4	22

N = 22

The table reports the contract period for road maintenance contracts

* Data on contract length for road maintenance contracts were provided for 22 Local Authorities out of 28 Local Authorities indicating a use of private contractors for provision of road maintenance.

** Out of 6 Local Authorities that normally use an ordinary contract length of 7 years, 5 responded that they operate with an option for a 7-year extension as well.

*** Local Authorities with contract lengths that fall in the category of 'ten or more years' normally operate with ordinary contract lengths of up to 28 years.

Survey item: Q6b

Table 37 shows the average contract period for parks and roads maintenance contracts. The average contract period for roads is almost two years longer (7.3 years) than the average contract for parks (5.5 years). The longest contract period for both park and road maintenance is 28 years. The average period for optional extension of the contract is 3.9 years for park maintenance contracts and 4.9 years for road maintenance contracts. For both parks and roads, the variation in contract length and extension length is relatively high (S.D. ranging from 3.8 to 7.2).

Table 37.
Average contract period (in years) for parks and roads maintenance contracts

Statistics	Parks		Roads	
	Ordinary contract	Option for extension	Ordinary contract	Option for extension
N	51	44	22	18
Mean	5.5	3.9	7.3	5.3
S.D.	4.3	3.8	7.2	4.9
Minimum	0	0	0	0
Maximum	28	20	28	20

N = 51 (Parks), N = 22 (Roads).

The table reports the average contract period (in years) for parks and roads maintenance contracts in English Local Authorities.

Survey item: Q6a & Q6b.

OUTCOMES, EFFECTS AND PERFORMANCE

Summary

This section provides data and statistics on the outcomes, effects and performance in relation to the use of both private and in-house providers of park and road maintenance.

Measured on a scale from 0 (very unsatisfied) to 10 (very satisfied), Local Authorities are on the average most satisfied with performance of private contractors' provision of park and road maintenance services related to the '*quality of maintenance services*' (mean score = 7.6 for parks and 7.4 for roads) and the '*price / cost levels*' (mean score = 7.8 for parks and 7.2 for roads). Local Authorities are least satisfied with the performance related to '*long-term service objectives*' in case of both park and road maintenance (mean score = 6.3 for parks and 6.5 for roads) as well as '*development and innovative thinking*' (mean score = 6.4 for parks and 6.6 for roads). For five out of the six performance dimensions there is no significant difference between the scores for private contractors' provision of road and park maintenance services. The satisfaction with '*price / cost levels*' is statistically significantly higher for park maintenance (mean score = 7.8) compared to road maintenance (mean score = 7.2).

Measured on a scale from 0 (very unsatisfied) to 10 (very satisfied), Local Authorities are on the average most satisfied with performance of in-house provision of park and road maintenance services related to '*flexibility and change*' (mean score = 8.5 for parks and 8.4 for roads). The performance of '*development and innovative thinking*' in in-house provisions of park and road maintenance has the lowest mean scores (mean score = 7.8 in the case of both parks and roads).

Based on responses to questions on the effects on the total price and cost level for services contracted out after the last round of procurement for maintenance of parks and roads, the majority of respondents have indicated a decrease in costs from last time maintenance services were contracted out (33 out of 44 respondents for parks and 18 out of 22 respondents for roads).

Based on the responses to questions on the effects on the quality level of services contracted out after the last round of procurement for maintenance of parks and roads, the most common indication among respondents is that of a decrease in quality from last time maintenance services were contracted out (19 out of 44 respondents for parks and 8 out of 22 respondents for roads).

The effects from the use of private contractors on in-house service provisions of parks and road maintenance were evaluated on a scale from 0 (affected quite negatively) to 10 (affected quite positively) for five performance dimensions. The effects were generally evaluated as slightly

positive. The mean scores were highest for '*flexibility in service provisions*' (6.5) and '*operational methods and routines for providing services*' (6.5) and lowest for '*staff's well-being and work motivation*' (5.4).

The effects from the use of private contractors on local planning and management of parks and road maintenance were evaluated on a scale from 0 (very negative impact) to 10 (very positive impact) for eight performance dimensions. The mean scores were highest for '*management of maintenance budgets*' (6.7) and lowest for '*ability to serve the political level*' (6.0)

The cost effects of contracting out was evaluated based on self-reported estimates for cost change from the Local Authorities' last round of procurement of park and road maintenance services. Most of respondents who provided information about cost effects of contracting out reported a decrease in cost from last time services were contracted out for both park and road services (33 out of 44 cases for parks and 18 out of 22 cases for roads).

The cost effects as a result of in-house maintenance work being subject to competitive tendering was evaluated based on self-reported estimates from respondents. The majority of respondents have reported that in-house maintenance work being subject to tender competition has resulted in a decrease in cost of maintenance services for both parks and roads (respectively 22 out of 29 cases for parks and 10 out of 16 cases for roads).

The effects from the use of private contractors on in-house service provisions of parks and road maintenance was evaluated on a scale from 0 (affected quite negatively) to 10 (affected quite positively) for five performance dimensions. The mean scores were highest for '*flexibility in service provisions*' and '*operational methods and routines for providing services*' (mean = 6.5 in both cases).

The effects from the use of private contractors on local planning and management of parks and road maintenance was evaluated on a scale from 0 (affected quite negatively) to 10 (affected quite positively) for eight performance dimensions. The effects were generally evaluated as neutral or slightly positive. The mean scores were highest '*management of maintenance budgets*' (6.7) and lowest for '*ability to serve the political level*' (6.0).

How the contribution of private contractors to parks and road maintenance will change over the next five years was measured based on the number of responses to questions regarding respondents' expectations regarding the issue. The most common expectations were that the contribution of private contractors to park and road maintenance will stay the same over the next five years (23.0% of respondents indicated an expectation of this). The most common expectations regarding how the

contribution of in-house providers to park and road maintenance will change over the next five years were that it will either stay the same or decrease (45.9% of respondents indicated this for parks and 18.8% for roads).

Drivers for change in the way Local Authorities deliver maintenance of parks and roads were evaluated on a scale from 0 (not at all) to 10 (to a very high degree) for eleven different purposes. The highest ranked driver for change was found to be '*address changing budget pressures*' (mean = 9.2) while '*provide work the Local Authority cannot do*' and '*develop and renew areas and services*' (mean = 5.6 for both) were the lowest ranked.

Barriers to change of the ways Local Authorities deliver maintenance of parks and roads were evaluated on a scale from 0 (not at all) to 10 (to a very high degree) for ten different barriers. The highest ranked barrier to change was found to be '*uncertainty over future budgets / resources*' (mean = 7.9) while '*lack of experience / knowledge*' (mean = 5.6) was the lowest ranked.

Performance evaluations

Table 38 shows the evaluation of six performance dimensions of park and road maintenance services provided by private contractors. Performance was measured by the level of satisfaction on an 11-point scale where 0 = ‘very unsatisfied’ to 10 = ‘very satisfied’.

English Local Authorities are on the average most satisfied with the ‘*quality of maintenance services*’ (mean score = 7.6 for parks and 7.4 for roads) and the ‘*price / cost levels*’ (mean score = 7.8 for parks and 7.2 for roads) in case of both park and road maintenance. Local Authorities are least satisfied with ‘*long-term service objectives*’ in case of both park and road maintenance (mean score = 6.3 for parks and 6.5 for roads) as well as ‘*development and innovative thinking*’ (mean score = 6.4 for parks and 6.6 for roads). For five out of the six performance dimensions there is no significant difference between the scores for private contractors’ provision of road and park maintenance services. The satisfaction with ‘*price / cost levels*’ is statistically significantly higher for park maintenance (mean score = 7.8) compared to road maintenance (mean score = 7.2).

Table 38.
Performance evaluations of private contractors’ provision of road and park maintenance services

Performance dimension*	Park maintenance (N=57)			Road maintenance (N=23)		
	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.
Quality of maintenance services	57	7.6	1.9	23	7.4	2.4
Price / cost levels	56	7.8	1.7	23	7.2	2.6
Flexibility and change	57	7.6	2.1	23	7.3	2.9
Follow- up and problem solving	57	7.5	2.0	23	7.2	2.6
Development and innovative thinking	55	6.4	2.5	22	6.6	2.5
Satisfaction of long-term service objectives	55	6.3	2.6	22	6.5	2.9

Total N= 57 (parks). N = 23 (Roads).

The table reports the evaluation of six performance dimensions of park and road maintenance services provided by private contractors. Paired samples T-tests for each performance dimension shows no statistical significance at p-levels < .1 between road and park maintenance except for ‘price / cost levels’ where $p = 0.024$ and $t(20) = 2.434$.

* Data based on self-reported evaluations based on responses for all items on an 11-point response scale with anchors (0 = ‘very unsatisfied’ and 10 = ‘very satisfied’).

Survey item: Q9a & Q9b

Table 39 shows the scores for road and park departments in English Local Authorities' satisfaction with the performance of in-house provision of road and park maintenance services. Performance was measured by the level of satisfaction on an 11-point scale where 0 = 'very unsatisfied' to 10 = 'very satisfied'.

In general, the Local Authorities are highly satisfied with in-house provision of both park and road maintenance. *'flexibility and change'* in in-house provisions of park and road maintenance has the highest mean scores (respectively 8.5 and 8.4). *'development and innovative thinking'* in in-house provisions of park and road maintenance has the lowest mean scores (mean score = 7.8 for both).

Table 39.
Performance evaluations of in-house provision of road and park maintenance services

Performance dimension	Park maintenance (N=67)			Road maintenance (N=33)		
	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.
Quality of maintenance services	67	8.2	1.2	33	8.0	1.2
Price / cost levels	66	8.1	1.5	33	8.2	1.5
Flexibility and change	67	8.5	1.4	33	8.4	1.5
Follow- up and problem solving	67	8.1	1.4	33	8.2	1.3
Development and innovative thinking	65	7.8	1.7	32	7.8	1.6
Satisfaction of long-term service objectives	66	8.1	1.6	32	7.8	1.7

Total N= 67 (parks). N = 33 (Roads)

The table reports the evaluation of six performance dimensions of park and road maintenance services provided in-house. Paired T-tests for each performance dimension shows no statistical significance at p-levels < .1 between road and park maintenance for any of the dimensions.

* Data based on self-reported evaluations based on responses for all items on an 11-point response scale with anchors (0 = 'very unsatisfied' and 10 = 'very satisfied').

Survey item: Q24a & Q25a

Table 40 shows the scores for road and park departments in English Local Authorities' satisfaction with the performance of other types of provision of road and park maintenance services. Performance was measured by the level of satisfaction on an 11-point scale where 0 = 'very unsatisfied' to 10 = 'very satisfied'.

In general, the Local Authorities are moderately satisfied with other types of provision of both park and road maintenance. *'price / cost levels'* of other types of provisions of park and road maintenance has the highest mean scores (respectively 7.7 and 8.0). *'follow-up and problem solving'* among other types of providers of park and road maintenance has the lowest mean scores (respectively 5.5 and 7.2).

Table 40.
Performance evaluations of other types of provision of road and park maintenance services

Performance dimension	Park maintenance (N=67)			Road maintenance (N=33)		
	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.
Quality of maintenance services	46	7.5	1.7	13	7.7	1.4
Price / cost levels	39	7.7	2.3	10	8.0	0.7
Flexibility and change	43	6.8	2.4	13	6.9	2.6
Follow- up and problem solving	45	5.5	2.5	13	7.2	2.3
Development and innovative thinking	45	5.5	2.3	11	7.6	1.4
Satisfaction of long-term service objectives	45	7.4	2.0	12	7.3	2.5

Total N= 46 (parks). N = 13 (Roads)

The table reports the evaluation of six performance dimensions of park and road maintenance services provided by other types of providers. Paired T-tests for each performance dimension shows no statistical significance at p-levels < .1 between road and park maintenance for any of the dimensions.

* Data based on self-reported evaluations based on responses for all items on an 11-point response scale with anchors (0 = 'very unsatisfied' and 10 = 'very satisfied').

Survey item: Q34a.

Cost effects of contracting out

Table 41 shows the direction of self-reported estimates for cost change from the Local Authorities' last round of procurement of park and road maintenance services. Estimates were provided for 44 Local Authorities in the case of park maintenance and for 22 Local Authorities in the case of road maintenance.

The majority of respondents have reported a decrease in costs from last time services were contracted out for both park and road maintenance (respectively 33 and 18 cases).

Table 41.
Direction of self-reported estimates on cost change from last times services were contracted out

Cost change	Frequencies			
	Parks		Roads	
	Absolute	Relative	Absolute	Relative
N	122	100%	122	100%
Decreased costs	33	27.0%	18	14.8%
No cost change	8	6.6%	2	1.6%
Increased costs	3	2.5%	2	1.6%
Don't know	5	4.1%	4	3.3%
No answer	73	59.8%	96	78.7%

N = 122

The table reports about the direction of self-reported estimates on cost change from last times services were contracted out.

Data is based on the number of responses to questions on the effects on the total price and cost level for services contracted out after the last round of procurement for park and roads.

Survey item: Q16a & q16b

Quality effects of contracting out

Table 42 shows the direction of self-reported estimates for quality change from the Local Authorities' last round of procurement of park and road maintenance services. Estimates were provided for 44 Local Authorities in the case of park maintenance and for 22 Local Authorities in the case of road maintenance.

Table 42.
Direction of self-reported estimates on quality change from last times services were contracted out

Quality change	Frequencies			
	Parks		Roads	
	Absolute	Relative	Absolute	Relative
N	122	100%	122	100%
Decrease	19	15.6%	8	6.6%
No change	14	11.5%	8	6.6%
Increase	11	9.0%	6	4.9%
Don't know	5	4.1%	4	3.3%
No answer	73	59.8%	96	78.7%

N = 122

The table reports about the direction of self-reported estimates on quality change from last times services were contracted out.

Data is based on the number of responses to questions on the effects on the quality level of services contracted out after the last round of procurement of maintenance services for park and roads.

Survey item: Q16a & Q16b

Cost effects as a result of in-house maintenance work being subject to tender competition

Table 43 shows the direction of self-reported estimates for cost change as a result of in-house maintenance work being subject to tender competition. Estimates were provided for 29 Local Authorities in the case of park maintenance and for 16 Local Authorities in the case of road maintenance.

The majority of respondents have reported that in-house maintenance work being subject to tender competition has resulted in a decrease in cost of maintenance services for both parks and roads (respectively 22 and 10 cases).

Table 43.
Direction of self-reported estimates on cost change as a result of in-house maintenance work being subject to tender competition

Cost change	Frequencies			
	Parks		Roads	
	Absolute	Relative	Absolute	Relative
N	122	100%	122	100%
Decreased costs	22	18.0%	10	8.2%
No cost change	4	4.9%	5	4.1%
Increased costs	3	2.5%	1	0.8%
Don't know	1	0.8%	2	1.6%
No answer	92	75.4%	104	85.2%

N = 122

The table reports about the direction of self-reported estimates on cost change as a result of in-house maintenance work being subject to tender competition

Data is based on the number of responses to questions on the effects on the total price and cost level for maintenance services as a result of in-house service maintenance work being subject to tender competition.

Survey item: Q29a & Q29b

Quality effects as a result of in-house maintenance work being subject to tender competition

Table 44 shows the direction of self-reported estimates for changes in quality as a result of in-house maintenance work being subject to tender competition. Estimates were provided for 29 Local Authorities in the case of park maintenance and for 16 Local Authorities in the case of road maintenance.

Table 44.
Direction of self-reported estimates on quality change as a result of in-house maintenance work being subject to tender competition

Quality change	Frequencies			
	Parks		Roads	
	Absolute	Relative	Absolute	Relative
N	122	100%	122	100%
Decrease	9	7.4%	5	4.1%
No change	8	6.6%	6	4.9%
Increase	12	9.8%	5	4.1%
Don't know	1	0.8%	2	1.6%
No answer	92	75.4%	104	85.2%

N = 122

The table reports about the direction of self-reported estimates on service quality as a result of in-house maintenance work being subject to tender competition

Data is based on the number of responses to questions on the effects on quality of maintenance services as a result of in-house service maintenance work being subject to tender competition.

Survey item: Q29a & Q29b

Competition effects on internal service management and provision

Table 45 shows English Local Authorities' evaluation of the effects from the use of private contractors on in-house service provisions of parks and road maintenance.

On a scale from 0 (affected quite negatively) to 10 (affected quite positively), the effects are generally evaluated as slightly positive. The mean scores are highest for '*flexibility in service provisions*' (6.5) and '*operational methods and routines for providing services*' (6.5) while '*staff's well-being and motivation*' has the lowest mean score (5.4). The variation in the evaluations are largest for '*quality levels in service provisions*' (S.D. = 2.7) and '*staff's well-being and work motivation*' (S.D. = 2.6).

Table 45.
Effects from the use of private contractors on in-house service provisions of parks and road maintenance

Dimension of in-house service provision*	N	Mean	S.D.
<i>Price and cost levels in service provisions</i>	28	6.4	2.5
<i>Quality levels in service provisions</i>	28	6.1	2.7
<i>Flexibility in service provisions</i>	28	6.5	2.0
<i>Operational methods and routines for providing services</i>	28	6.5	1.6
<i>Staff's well-being and work motivation</i>	29	5.4	2.6

N=29

The table reports about the effects from the use of private contractors on in-house service provisions of parks and road maintenance.

* The table shows findings generated from data for the following question. "In your opinion to what degree has being in-house maintenance provision been positively or negatively affected by being subjected to tender competition in relation to: 'pricing and cost of the maintenance', 'level of quality of maintenance delivery', 'flexibility to change and / or improve services if required', 'maintenance operations and procedures' and 'the well-being, motivation and job satisfaction of the employees' on a scale from 0 to 10 where 0 = 'affected quite negatively' and 10 = 'affected quite positively'.

Survey item: Q30a

Table 46 shows English Local Authorities' evaluation of the effects from the use of private contractors on local planning and management of parks and road maintenance.

On a scale from 0 (very negative impact) to 10 (very positive impact), the effects are all evaluated as slightly positive. The mean scores are highest for '*management of maintenance budgets*' (6.7) and lowest for '*ability to serve the political level*' (6.0). The variation in the evaluations is largest for '*ability to get new ideas and think differently*' (S.D. = 2.2) and smallest for '*organizational methods and routines*' (S.D. = 1.6).

Table 46.
Effects from the use of private contractors on local planning and management of parks and road maintenance

Management dimension*	N	Mean	S.D.
<i>Organizational methods and routines</i>	52	6.4	1.6
<i>Information and knowledge on services</i>	50	6.1	2.0
<i>Ability to get new ideas and think differently</i>	52	6.1	2.2
<i>Focus on planning and development of services</i>	52	6.2	2.0
<i>Management of maintenance operations</i>	50	6.3	2.1
<i>Management of maintenance budgets</i>	51	6.7	2.1
<i>Ability to serve political level</i>	51	6.0	2.0
<i>Ability to serve citizens and users</i>	51	6.1	2.1

N=52

* Data based on self-reported evaluations based on responses for all items on an 11-point response scale with anchors (0 = "very negative impact" and 10 = "very positive impact").

Survey item: Q17a

Expected future contribution of different organisations to parks and roads maintenance

Table 47 shows the respondents expectation of how the contribution of private contractors to parks and road maintenance will change over the next five years. Estimates were provided for 79 Local Authorities in the case of park maintenance and for 42 Local Authorities in the case of road maintenance.

The most common expectation among respondents is that the contribution of private contractors to park and road maintenance will stay the same over the next five years. 23.0% of respondents expect the contribution of private contractors to park maintenance will stay the same over the next five years and 15.6% of respondents expect the contribution of private contractors to road maintenance will stay the same over the next five years.

The least common expectation is that the contribution of private contractors will stop completely (1.6% of all respondents indicated an expectation of this in the case of both parks and road maintenance).

Table 47.
Expected change in contribution of private contractors to parks and roads maintenance.

Over the next five years the contribution of private contractors will:	Frequencies			
	Parks		Roads	
	Absolute	Relative	Absolute	Relative
N	122	100%	122	100%
Decrease	19	15.6%	4	3.3%
Stay the same	28	23.0%	19	15.6%
Increase	21	17.2%	9	7.4%
Stop completely	2	1.6%	2	1.6%
Don't know	9	7.4%	8	6.6%
No answer	43	35.2%	80	65.6%

N = 122

The table reports about the direction of self-reported estimates on how the contribution of private contractors to parks and roads maintenance will change over the next five years.

Data is based on the number of responses to questions on how they expect the contribution of different organisations to parks and roads maintenance will change over the next five years.

Survey item: Q37a & Q37b

Table 48 shows the respondents expectation of how the contribution of in-house providers to parks and road maintenance will change over the next five years. Estimates were provided for 77 Local Authorities in the case of park maintenance and for 38 Local Authorities in the case of road maintenance.

The most common expectation among respondents is that the contribution of in-house providers to park and road maintenance will either stay the same or decrease over the next five years. 45.9% of respondents expect the contribution of in-house providers to park maintenance will either stay the same or decrease over the next five years, and 18.8% of respondents expect the contribution of in-house providers to road maintenance will either stay the same or decrease over the next five years.

The least common expectation is that the contribution of in-house providers will stop completely (2.5% of all respondents indicated an expectation of this in the case of both parks and road maintenance).

Table 48.
Expected change in contribution of in-house providers to parks and roads maintenance.

Over the next five years the contribution of in-house providers will:	Frequencies			
	Parks		Roads	
	Absolute	Relative	Absolute	Relative
N	122	100%	122	100%
Decrease	29	23.8%	11	9.0%
Stay the same	27	22.1%	12	9.8%
Increase	10	8.2%	6	4.9%
Stop completely	3	2.5%	3	2.5%
Don't know	8	6.6%	6	4.9%
No answer	45	36.9%	84	68.9%

N = 122

The table reports about the direction of self-reported estimates on how the contribution of in-house providers to parks and roads maintenance will change over the next five years.

Data is based on the number of responses to questions on how they expect the contribution of different organisations to parks and roads maintenance will change over the next five years.

Survey item: Q37a & Q37b

Table 49 shows the respondents expectation of how the contribution of other types of providers to parks and road maintenance will change over the next five years. Estimates were provided for 43 Local Authorities in the case of park maintenance and for 23 Local Authorities in the case of road maintenance.

Only few respondents provided information for their expectation of how the contribution of other types of providers to park and road maintenance will change over the next five years. Among the few respondents that did provide information, the only expectations found are that the contribution of other types of providers is expected to either stay the same or decrease over the next five years (this was found for 13.2% of respondents in the case of park maintenance and for 10.7% of respondents in the case of road maintenance).

Table 49.
Expected change in contribution of other types of providers to parks and roads maintenance.

Over the next five years the contribution of other types of providers will:	Frequencies			
	Parks		Roads	
	Absolute	Relative	Absolute	Relative
N	122	100%	122	100%
Decrease	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Stay the same	8	6.6%	5	4.1%
Increase	8	6.6%	8	6.6%
Stop completely	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Don't know	27	22.1%	10	8.2%
No answer	79	64.8%	99	81.1%

N = 122

The table reports about the direction of self-reported estimates on how the contribution of other types of providers to parks and roads maintenance will change over the next five years.

Data is based on the number of responses to questions on how they expect the contribution of different organisations to parks and roads maintenance will change over the next five years.

Survey item: Q37a & Q37b

Drivers for change

Table 50 provides an overview of altogether eleven different drivers for change in the way local authorities expect to deliver park and road maintenance over the next five years. Drivers for change are measured on a response scale from 0 to 10 where 0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘to a very high degree’.

The highest ranked drivers for change are ‘*address changing budget pressures*’ (mean = 9.2) and ‘*cost effective maintenance*’ (mean = 8.8) while ‘*provide work the Local Authority cannot do*’ (mean = 5.6) and ‘*develop and renew areas and services*’ (mean = 5.6) are the lowest ranked.

Table 50.
Drivers for change in the way Local Authorities deliver maintenance

Drivers for change	N	Mean	S.D.
<i>High maintenance quality</i>	80	6.2	2.9
<i>Cost effective maintenance</i>	83	8.8	1.6
<i>To ensure flexible maintenance</i>	82	7.9	2.5
<i>Test and benchmark prices</i>	81	6.7	2.6
<i>Provide work the Local Authority cannot do</i>	81	5.6	3.7
<i>Develop and renew areas and services</i>	81	5.6	3.3
<i>Develop internal organisation and work routines</i>	82	6.6	2.7
<i>To comply with internal political aims</i>	84	7.8	2.3
<i>To comply with external political aims</i>	83	7.2	2.7
<i>Address changing budget pressures</i>	84	9.2	1.3
<i>To focus on strategic management (instead of day to day maintenance)</i>	82	5.9	3.0

N = 84

The table reports about drivers for change in the way local authorities deliver maintenance of parks and roads over the next five years.

Data based on self-reported evaluations based on responses for all items on an 11-point response scale with anchors (0 = ‘not at all’ = ‘to a very high degree’).

Survey item: Q38a

Barriers to change

Table 51 provides an overview of altogether ten different barriers to change of the ways local authorities expect to deliver park and road maintenance over the next five years. Barriers to change are measured on a response scale from 0 to 10 where 0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘to a very high degree’.

The highest ranked barriers to change are ‘*uncertainty over future budgets / resources*’ (mean = 7.9) and ‘*lack of staff resources*’ (mean = 7.4) while ‘*lack of experience / knowledge*’ (mean = 5.6) and ‘*internal Local Authority staff culture*’ (mean = 5.9) are the lowest ranked.

Table 51.
Barriers to change in the way Local Authorities deliver maintenance

Barriers to change	N	Mean	S.D.
<i>Local political aims or priorities</i>	82	6.4	2.9
<i>National political aims or priorities</i>	80	6.4	2.9
<i>Internal aims or priorities</i>	81	6.1	2.9
<i>Local political culture</i>	80	6.4	3.0
<i>Internal Local Authority staff culture</i>	79	5.9	3.0
<i>Lack of staff resources</i>	81	7.4	2.8
<i>Lack of / or inflexible internal structures, procedures or systems</i>	81	5.8	3.0
<i>Lack of experience / knowledge</i>	81	5.6	2.7
<i>Uncertainty over future budgets / resources</i>	82	7.9	2.2
<i>User / community concerns</i>	81	6.0	3.0

N = 82

The table reports about barriers to change of the ways local authorities deliver maintenance of parks and roads over the next five years.

Data based on self-reported evaluations based on responses for all items on an 11-point response scale with anchors (0 = ‘not at all’ = ‘to a very high degree’).

Survey item: Q39a

SURVEY

Dear participant

In the following questionnaire, you will be asked about your organisation and how you have structured the management and maintenance of parks and other green spaces and streets and highways, referred to as streetscene.

Parks and green space functions include: grounds maintenance, tree maintenance, rangers, recreation services, allotments, children's play areas, cemeteries, sports grounds and playing fields (but not indoor sports facilities), social housing sites, countryside sites, nature reserves, woodlands.

Streetscene functions include: inspection, carriageway repairs, cleansing, gritting, street lighting, street-trees, verge maintenance.

The questionnaire is structured such that you will only need to answer questions that relate to those functions and services for which your department has responsibility. Depending on whether you are responsible for parks and green spaces or streetscene, or both it will take 20 to 30 minutes to complete..

You can stop and resume the questionnaire at any time using the link we have sent you.

Press the 'next' button to answer the first question.

Q1
Your position in the Local Authority

Q1a
Which of the following best describes your current position?

Director or equivalent (e.g. Director of Service)	Department or Section Manager/Head or equivalent (e.g.Head of Service)	Group/Team/Area Manager or equivalent (e.g. group leader)	Employee (no management responsibility)	Other (please describe)
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> __

Q1b
Please add your Job Title here:

Q1c
Please briefly outline your role and responsibility here:

Q1d
Please add specific comments relating to your reply here:

Q2**Department Role and Responsibilities****What role does your department have, and which functions are they responsible for?****Q2a****Parks and green spaces**

Tick all boxes that apply.

- ☐ My department has no responsibility for parks and green spaces.
- ☐ Overall planning, strategy and development (e.g. city / district wide development plan / open space strategy)
- ☐ Statutory functions and administration (e.g. legislation relating to green spaces)
- ☐ Overall operational planning (e.g. client role / procurement of services, contract documents, management plans, quality descriptions)
- ☐ Control and supervision of delivery (e.g. contract management)
- ☐ Practical delivery (e.g. contractor role / day to day maintenance)
- ☐ Overall budget planning and monitoring.
- ☐ Site development (e.g. project development, site activation / events, community engagement)

Describe any other important areas of responsibility your department has relating to parks and green spaces

Q2b**Streetscene**

Tick all boxes that apply.

- ☐ My department has no responsibility for streetscene
- ☐ Overall planning, strategy and development (e.g. city / district wide development plan / open space strategy)
- ☐ Statutory functions and administration (e.g. legislation relating to highways)
- ☐ Overall operational planning (e.g. procurement of services, contract documents, management plans, quality descriptions)
- ☐ Control and supervision of delivery (e.g. contract management)
- ☐ Practical delivery (e.g. day to day maintenance)
- ☐ Overall budget planning and monitoring

Describe any other important areas of responsibility your department has relating to streetscene

Please add specific comments relating to your reply here

Q3**Who carries out maintenance work for your department?****Q3a****Parks and green spaces**

Which organisations contribute to maintaining parks and green spaces? Please estimate *their % contribution to overall maintenance delivery*. A good guess is better than no answer.

Please tick all boxes that apply.

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------|---------|---------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Private contractors | Approx. | % overall delivery. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | In-house operation | Approx. | % overall delivery. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Other | Approx. | % overall delivery. |

Q3b**If you ticked 'other', which organisation are they?**

Please tick all boxes that apply.

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|---------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Public / private joint venture | Approx. | % overall delivery. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Local social enterprise | Approx. | % overall delivery. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Other Government organisation (e.g. Environment Agency) | Approx. | % overall delivery. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | National or local third sector organisation (e.g Wildlife Trust, local Trust) | Approx. | % overall delivery. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Community Groups (e.g. Friends of groups) | Approx. | % overall delivery. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Other – please specify | Approx. | % overall delivery. |

Q3c**How has the contribution of different organisations to maintaining parks and green spaces changed over the past 5 years?**

Please tick all boxes that apply.

- | | | | | |
|---------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Private contractors | same <input type="checkbox"/> | increase <input type="checkbox"/> | decrease <input type="checkbox"/> | don't know <input type="checkbox"/> |
| In-house operation | same <input type="checkbox"/> | increase <input type="checkbox"/> | decrease <input type="checkbox"/> | don't know <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other | same <input type="checkbox"/> | increase <input type="checkbox"/> | decrease <input type="checkbox"/> | don't know <input type="checkbox"/> |

If you ticked 'other' can you please indicate to what extent their contribution has changed over the past 5 years.

- | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Public / private joint venture | same <input type="checkbox"/> | increase <input type="checkbox"/> | decrease <input type="checkbox"/> | don't know <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Local social enterprise | same <input type="checkbox"/> | increase <input type="checkbox"/> | decrease <input type="checkbox"/> | don't know <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Other Government organisation (e.g. Environment Agency) | same <input type="checkbox"/> | increase <input type="checkbox"/> | decrease <input type="checkbox"/> | don't know <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | National or local third sector organisation (e.g Wildlife Trust, RSPB). | same <input type="checkbox"/> | increase <input type="checkbox"/> | decrease <input type="checkbox"/> | don't know <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Community Groups (e.g. Friends of groups). | same <input type="checkbox"/> | increase <input type="checkbox"/> | decrease <input type="checkbox"/> | don't know <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Other – please specify | same <input type="checkbox"/> | increase <input type="checkbox"/> | decrease <input type="checkbox"/> | don't know <input type="checkbox"/> |

Q3d**Streetscene**

Which organisations contribute to streetscene maintenance? Please estimate their % contribution to overall maintenance delivery. A good guess is better than no answer.

Please tick all boxes that apply.

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------|---------|---------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Private contractors | Approx. | % overall delivery. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | In-house operation | Approx. | % overall delivery. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Other | Approx. | % overall delivery. |

Q3e

If you ticked 'other', which other types of organisation contribute? _____

Q3f**How has the contribution of different organisations to streetscene maintenance changed over the past 5 years?**

Tick all boxes that apply.

- | | | | | |
|---------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Private contractors | same <input type="checkbox"/> | increase <input type="checkbox"/> | decrease <input type="checkbox"/> | don't know <input type="checkbox"/> |
| In-house operation | same <input type="checkbox"/> | increase <input type="checkbox"/> | decrease <input type="checkbox"/> | don't know <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other | same <input type="checkbox"/> | increase <input type="checkbox"/> | decrease <input type="checkbox"/> | don't know <input type="checkbox"/> |

Please add specific comments relating to your reply here: _____

In the following section, we will ask about your use of private contractors to maintain parks and green spaces and/ or streetscene.

Q4
Level of experience.

Q4a
Please rate on a scale of 0-10 the level of experience of working with the private sector to maintain parks and green spaces and/ or streetscene.

	None at all 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	A very high degree 10	Don't know
Your personal experience of working with the private sector to deliver maintenance for the local authority.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Your department's level of experience of working with the private sector to deliver maintenance for the local authority.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q4b
Please add specific comments relating to your reply here:

Q5**Number of contracts**

How many contracts does your department currently have with private contractors for delivering maintenance?

Q5a**Parks and green spaces**

- ☐ None
- ☐ 1
- ☐ 2
- ☐ 3
- ☐ 4 or more
- ☐ don't know

Q5b**Streetscene**

- ☐ None
- ☐ 1
- ☐ 2
- ☐ 3
- ☐ 4 or more
- ☐ don't know

Q5c

Do you have a combined contract for the maintenance of parks and green spaces and streetscene?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Don't know

Q5d

Is the maintenance of parks and green spaces and / or streetscene bundled into any other contract? If so please describe below.

Q5e

Please add specific comments relating to your reply here:

Q6**What is the length of the main contract for maintenance?***If you have multiple contracts of different lengths, then specify the length of the most significant one.**If you have a combined parks and green spaces and streetscene contract please fill in both sets of boxes.***Q6a****Parks and green spaces**

The agreed contract period is normally _____ years

Possible option for extension of the
Optional extension period is for _____ years

How many years has the current contract left to run? _____ years

Q6b**Streetscene**

The agreed contract period is normally _____ years

Possible option for extension of the
Optional extension period is for _____ years

How many years has the current contract left to run? _____ years

Q6c**Please add specific comments relating to your reply here:**

Q7**Reasons for using the private sector.****Q7a**

Specify on a scale of 0 to 10 the degree to which you think that the following are important drivers for using the private sector to maintain parks and green spaces and / or steetscene.

The driver and/ or purpose is...	Not at all 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	To a very high degree 10	Don't know
... to achieve high-quality maintenance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... to achieve cost effective maintenance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... to ensure flexibility of delivery	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... to test and benchmark prices	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... to carry out work that the local authority cannot do	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... to develop and renew sites and services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... to develop / improve internal working methods	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... to address changing budget pressures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...to allow the department to focus on strategic management (instead of day to day maintenance)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Any other important reasons? Please describe here. _____

Q7b

Please add specific comments relating to your reply here:

Q8**Internal backing for use of the private sector****Q8a**

Specify on a scale of 0 to 10 the degree to which you think that the use of the private sector to maintain parks and green spaces and / or streetscene is...

	Not at all 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	To a very high degree 10	Don't know
... an internal political desire of the Local Authority	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... a desire of the Local Authority's internal administration	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... subject to on-going internal political debate within the Local Authority	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... subject to on-going debate within the Local Authority's internal administration?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q8b

Please add specific comments relating to your reply here:

Q9

Satisfaction with the private sector

Q9a

Parks and green spaces

Specify on a scale of 0 to 10 your level of satisfaction with the work private contractor(s) have undertaken in parks and green spaces in relation to:

	Very unsatisfie d 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Very satisfie d 10	Don't know
General quality of the service provided.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
General pricing and cost of the service provided.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Flexibility to change and/ or improve services if required.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Addressing issues and deficiencies in the service provided.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Development and innovation in services provided.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Delivery of long term goals for sites and facilities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Anything else relevant that you are satisfied/unsatisfied with? Please describe here_____												

Q9b**Streetscene**

Specify on a scale of 0 to 10 your level of satisfaction with the work private contractor(s) have undertaken in relation to streetscene:

	Very unsatisfie d 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Very satisfie d 10	Don't know
General quality of the service provided.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
General pricing and cost of the service provided.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Flexibility to change and/ or improve services if required.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Addressing issues and deficiencies in the service provided.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Development and innovation in services provided.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Delivery of long term goals for sites and facilities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Anything else relevant that you are satisfied/unsatisfied with? Please describe here_____												

Q10**Working relationship with the private contractors****Q10a**

On a scale of 0 to 10 to what degree do you think the following statements characterise the relationship between your department and private contractor(s)? For parks and green spaces and/ or streetscene.

	Not at all 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	To a very high degree 10	Don't know
We are both of the opinion that it is necessary to co-operate in order for each of us to attain our goals.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
We are both concerned with the other party attaining their goals.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
We are both prepared to make operational changes if it makes the work easier for one of the parties.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Neither of us would exploit a weakness or error made by the other for our own benefit.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
We both think it is OK to owe each other a favour.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Regardless of who bears the responsibility for an error, we think that the solution to the problem is a joint responsibility.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q10b

Please add specific comments relating to your reply here:

Q11

Management Approach

Q11a

Specify on a scale of 0 to 10 the degree to which you think that the following statements characterise your department's approach to managing private contractor(s)?

	Not at all 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	To a very high degree 10	Don't know
We prefer to use 'hard' measures such as fines and financial sanctions in cases of noncompliance.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
We meet often with the contractor to discuss service provision.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
We are focused on compliance with the contract specifications.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Our focus is co-operation with the contractor, in order to fulfil strategic objectives for sites and facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q11b

Please add specific comments relating to your reply here:

Q12**Capacity to manage contractors****Q12a**

Specify on a scale of 0 to 10 the degree to which you think that the following statements describe your department's capacity to manage private contractor(s)

	Not at all 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	To a very high degree 10	Don't know
We have sufficient organisational resources (e.g. time and staff)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
We have sufficient experience and expertise	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
We have sufficient methods and systems (e.g. quality standards, GIS and ICT systems)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Our management practices and procedures are sufficient.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q12b

Please add specific comments relating to your reply here:

Q13
Changes in capacity to manage private contractors

Q13a
Indicate on a scale of 0 to 10 the degree to which you think that the following statement describes the change in your department's capacity to manage private contractors over the last 5 years. *By capacity we mean, staff resources, time, expertise.*

	Not at all 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	To a very high degree 10	Don't know
My department's capacity to manage private contractors has increased over the last 5 years.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My department's capacity to manage private contractors has stayed the same over the last 5 years.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My department's capacity to manage private contractors has decreased over the last 5 years.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q14**Ability to check work**

What percentage of maintenance services undertaken by private contractors are

Q14a**Parks and green spaces**

	0 %	10 %	20 %	30 %	40 %	50 %	60 %	70 %	80 %	90 %	100 %	Don't know
...difficult to monitor (e.g. through inspections / quality check)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...difficult to carry out satisfactory without joint planning and discussion	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... easy to describe clearly	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q14b**Streetscene**

	0 %	10 %	20 %	30 %	40 %	50 %	60 %	70 %	80 %	90 %	100 %	Don't know
...difficult to monitor (e.g. through inspections / quality check)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...difficult to carry out satisfactory without joint planning and discussion	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... easy to describe clearly	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q14c

Please add specific comments relating to your reply here:

Q15

Contracts with the private sector

Q15a

Specify on a scale of 0 to 10 the degree to which the following content is central to your contract(s) with private contractor(s) for maintaining parks and green spaces and/ or streetscene

	Not at all 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	To a very high degree 10	Don't know
Formal legal clauses	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Performance specifications – describing overall goals, functionality and guidelines for operation and development.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Prescriptive specifications – based on quantities, instructions and performance measures.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Formal sanctions (e.g. financial penalties) for noncompliance.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Collaborative working between contractor and client.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Requirement for contractors to involve or liaise with users/ community.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Financial incentives (e.g. for optimisation / improvement.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Competence requirements (e.g. professional affiliation or qualification)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Requirements for delivering local benefits (e.g. using local labour, supporting events).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Any other content that is central? Please describe. _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q15b

Please add specific comments relating to your reply here:

Q16**Financial and quality impacts**

What has been the impact, on costs and quality of maintenance work, of the last round of contracting out?

Please tick the most relevant statement.

Q16a**Parks and green spaces**

- ☐ no change in cost or quality
- ☐ a cost saving with enhanced quality
- ☐ a cost saving, same quality
- ☐ a cost saving but a loss of quality
- ☐ a cost increase but with enhanced quality
- ☐ a cost increase, same quality
- ☐ a cost increase with loss of quality
- ☐ don't know.

Please describe what has influenced this situation.

Q16b**Streetscene**

- ☐ no change in cost or quality
- ☐ a cost saving with enhanced quality
- ☐ a cost saving, same quality
- ☐ a cost saving but a loss of quality
- ☐ a cost increase but with enhanced quality
- ☐ a cost increase, same quality
- ☐ a cost increase with loss of quality
- ☐ don't know.

Please describe what has influenced this situation

Q17**Impact of working with the private sector****Q17a**

To what degree do you believe that using and working with private contractors has had a positive or negative impact on your department in relation to...

	Very negativ e impact					Neutral 5					Very positive impact	Don't know
	0	1	2	3	4		6	7	8	9	10	
... your working methods and procedures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... your knowledge and information about sites and services (subject to contracts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... your ability to think innovatively and get new ideas	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... your focus on the planning and development of services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... your management of maintenance operations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... your management of maintenance budgets	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... your ability to deliver the political aspirations of the local authority	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... your ability to serve the community and users	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Please describe any other impacts. _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q17b

Please add specific comments relating to your reply here:

Q18

Risks and barriers in contracting out

Q18a

To what extent are the following issues, or barriers, to using private contractors for the maintenance of parks and green spaces and / or streetscene?

	Not at all 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	To a very high degree 10	Don't know
Getting enough contractors to submit tenders.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Contractor submitting unrealistic costs leading to poor delivery.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Contractor making unjustified assumptions / expectations leading to issues with delivery.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Contractors employing poorly qualified / inexperienced staff leading to issues with delivery.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Termination of contract or other issues due to contractor's financial situation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Policy / legislation preventing the best possible contractor or contractual arrangement being secured,	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Policy / legislation preventing more collaborative working with the contractor.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Legal issues / disputes resulting in issues with delivery.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Personal knowledge of policy / legislation / contract or procurement options.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

In the following section, we will be asking about your use of in-house providers to maintain parks and green spaces and/ or streetscene.

Q19
Level of experience.

Q19a
Please rate on a scale of 0-10 the level of experience of working with in-house service providers to maintain parks and green spaces and/ or streetscene.

	None at all 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	A very high degree 10	Don't know
Your personal experience of working with the in-house providers to deliver maintenance for the local authority.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Your department's level of experience of working with in-house providers to deliver maintenance for the local authority.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q19b
Please add specific comments relating to your reply here:

Q20**Management tools for managing in-house providers****Q20a**

Which of the following does the local authority use in its management and organisation of in-house maintenance of parks and green spaces and/or streetscene?

	Yes	No	Don't know
Business planning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Separation of client / procurement and delivery responsibilities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Independent budget and annual accounts (accounted for separately from other departments)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Independent management (executive / top level manager responsible for the departments' activities).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Independent monitoring / inspection of maintenance (e.g. undertaken by a separate unit)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Work carried out in-house is subject to competitive tendering.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
In-house teams able to offer services to other clients (internal and/or external).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q20b

Please tell us about any other specific management tools that you use.

Q20c

Please add specific comments relating to your reply here:

Q21**Separation of in-house maintenance from other functions**

Specify on a scale of 0 to 10 the degree to which responsibility for the following and in-house maintenance are 'organisationally separate' i.e. the responsibility of different sections or units within the department or local authority.

Q21a**Parks and green spaces**

	Not at all 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	To a very high degree 10	Don't know
Overall planning, strategy and development (e.g. city wide development plan / open space strategy)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Statutory functions and administration (e.g. legislation)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overall operational planning (e.g. procurement of services, management plans, quality descriptions)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Control and supervision of delivery (e.g. contract management)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overall planning and monitoring of operational budgets	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site development (e.g. project development, site activation / events, community engagement)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q21b

Please add specific comments relating to your reply here:

Q21c**Streetscene**

	Not at all 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	To a very high degree 10	Don't know
Overall planning, strategy and development (e.g. city wide development plan / open space strategy)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Statutory functions and administration (e.g. legislation)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overall operational planning (e.g. procurement of services, management plans, quality descriptions)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Control and supervision of delivery (e.g. contract management)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overall planning and monitoring of operational budgets	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overall planning and monitoring of operational budgets	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q21d

Please add specific comments relating to your reply here:

Q22**Reasons for using in-house providers**

Specify on a scale of 0 to 10 the degree to which you think that the following have influenced your organisation's decision to use in-house providers to maintain parks and green spaces and/ or streetscene

Q22a

The driver and/ or purpose is...

	Not at all 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	To a very high degree 10	Don't know
... to achieve high-quality maintenance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... to achieve cost effective maintenance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... to ensure flexibility of service delivery	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... to carry out work that only the local authority can do	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... to develop and renew areas and services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... to develop / improve internal working methods	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... to address changing budget pressures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
....to ensure capacity to carry out maintenance functions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...to preserve local jobs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q22b

Any other important reasons? Please describe here.

Q23**Internal backing for use of in-house providers****Q23a**

Specify on a scale of 0 to 10 the degree to which you think that the use of in-house providers to maintain parks and green spaces and / or streetscene is...

	Not at all 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	To a very high degree 10	Don't know
... an internal political desire of the local authority	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... a desire of the local authority's internal administration	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... subject to on-going internal political debate within the local authority	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... subject to on-going debate within the local authority's internal administration?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q23b

Please add specific comments relating to your reply here:

Q24 Satisfaction with in-house delivery - parks and green spaces**Q24a**

Specify on a scale of 0 to 10 how satisfied or unsatisfied you are with the work undertaken in-house relation to:

	Very unsatisfie d 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Very satisfie d 10	Don't know
General quality of the service provided.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
General pricing and cost of the service provided	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Flexibility to change and/ or improve services if required.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Addressing issues and deficiencies in the service provided.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Development and innovation in services provided.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Delivery of long term goals for sites and facilities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Anything else relevant that you are satisfied/unsatisfied with? Please describe here_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q24b

Is there anything else relevant that you are satisfied/unsatisfied with?

Q25**Satisfaction with in-house delivery – streetscene****Q25a**

Specify on a scale of 0 to 10 how satisfied or unsatisfied you are with the work undertaken in-house in relation to:

	Very unsatisfie d 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Very satisfie d 10	Don't know
General quality of the service provided.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
General pricing and cost of the service provided	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Flexibility to change and/ or improve services if required.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Addressing issues and deficiencies in the service provided.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Development and innovation in services provided.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Delivery of long term goals for sites and facilities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q25b

Anything else relevant that you are satisfied/unsatisfied with? Please describe here: _____

Q26

Working relationships with in-house providers

Q26a

On a scale of 0 to 10 to what degree do you think the following statements characterise the relationship between your department and in-house maintenance providers. For parks and green spaces and/ or streetscene.

	Not at all 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	To a very high degree 10	Don't know
We are both of the opinion that it is necessary to co-operate in order for each of us to be able to attain our goals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
We are both concerned with the other party attaining their goals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
We are both prepared to make operational changes if it makes the work easier for one of the parties	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Neither of us would exploit a weakness or error made by the other for our own benefit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
We both think it is OK to owe each other a favour	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Regardless of who bears the responsibility for an error, we think that the solution to the problem is a joint responsibility.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q26b

Please add specific comments relating to your reply here:

Q27**Management Approach****Q27a**

Specify on a scale of 0 to 10 the degree to which you think that the following statements characterise your department's approach to managing in-house providers?

	Not at all 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	To a very high degree 10	Don't know
We prefer to use 'hard' measures such as fines and financial sanctions in cases of noncompliance.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
We meet often with the provider to discuss service provision.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
We are focused on compliance with the contract specifications.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Our focus is co-operation with the provider, in order to fulfil strategic objectives for sites and facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q27b

Please add specific comments relating to your reply here:

Q28**Ability to check work**

What percentage of maintenance services undertaken by in-house providers are

Q28a**Parks and green spaces**

	0 %	10 %	20 %	30 %	40 %	50 %	60 %	70 %	80 %	90 %	100 %	Don't know
...difficult to monitor (e.g. through inspections / quality check)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...difficult to carry out satisfactory without joint planning and discussion	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... easy to describe clearly	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q28b**Streetscene**

	0 %	10 %	20 %	30 %	40 %	50 %	60 %	70 %	80 %	90 %	100 %	Don't know
...difficult to monitor (e.g. through inspections / quality check)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...difficult to carry out satisfactory without joint planning and discussion	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... easy to describe clearly	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q28c

Please add specific comments relating to your reply here:

Q29**Financial and quality impact**

What has been the impact, on costs and quality of in-house maintenance work, of being subject to tender competition?

Please tick the most relevant statement.

Q29a**Parks and green spaces**

- ☐ no change in cost or quality
- ☐ a cost saving with enhanced quality
- ☐ a cost saving, same quality
- ☐ a cost saving but a loss of quality
- ☐ a cost increase but with enhanced quality
- ☐ a cost increase, same quality
- ☐ a cost increase with loss of quality
- ☐ don't know.

Please describe what has influenced this situation.

Q29b**Streetscene**

- ☐ no change in cost or quality
- ☐ a cost saving with enhanced quality
- ☐ a cost saving, same quality
- ☐ a cost saving but a loss of quality
- ☐ a cost increase but with enhanced quality
- ☐ a cost increase, same quality
- ☐ a cost increase with loss of quality
- ☐ don't know.

Please describe what has influenced this situation

Q30**Impact of being subjected to tender competition****Q30a**

In your opinion to what degree has being in-house maintenance provision been positively or negatively affected by being subjected to tender competition in relation to...

	Affecte d quite negativ ely 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Affecte d quite positive ly 10	Don't know
... pricing and cost of the maintenance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... level of quality of maintenance delivery	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... flexibility to change and/ or improve services if required	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... maintenance operations and procedures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...the well-being, motivation and job satisfaction of the employees	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...												

Q30b

Please add specific comments relating to your reply here:

..

In the following section, we will be asking about your use of other organisations to maintain parks and green spaces

Q31

Please indicate which of the following organisations you answers will relate to.

- ☐ Public / private joint venture
- ☐ Local social enterprise
- ☐ Other Government organisation (e.g. Environment Agency)
- ☐ National or local third sector organisation (e.g Wildlife Trust, local Trust)
- ☐ Community Groups (e.g. Friends of groups)
- ☐ Other – please specify

Q32**Level of experience.**

Q32a

Please rate on a scale of 0-10 the level of experience of working with this type of organisation to maintain parks and green spaces.

	None at all 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	A very high degree 10	Don't know
Your personal experience of working with this type of organisation to deliver maintenance for the local authority.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Your department's level of experience of working with this type of organisation to deliver maintenance for the local authority.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q32b

Please add specific comments relating to your reply here:

Q33**Reasons for using other organisations.****Q33a**

Specify on a scale of 0 to 10 the degree to which you think that the following are important drivers for your use of this type of organisation to maintain parks and green spaces.

The driver and/ or purpose is...

	Not at all 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	To a very high degree 10	Don't know
... to achieve high-quality maintenance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... to achieve cost effective maintenance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... to ensure flexibility of delivery	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... to test and benchmark prices	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... to carry out work that the local authority cannot do	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... to develop and renew sites and services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... to develop / improve internal working methods	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... to address changing budget pressures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...to allow the department to focus on strategic management (instead of day to day maintenance)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q33b Any other important reasons? Please describe here. _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q33c

Please add specific comments relating to your reply here:

Q34

Satisfaction with other types of organisations**q34a**

Specify on a scale of 0 to 10 your level of satisfaction with the work other types of organisation(s) have undertaken in parks and green spaces in relation to:

	Very unsatisfie d 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Very satisfie d 10	Don't know
General quality of the service provided.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
General pricing and cost of the service provided	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Flexibility to change and/ or improve services if required.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Addressing issues and deficiencies in the service provided.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Development and innovation in services provided.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Delivery of long term goals for sites and facilities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Anything else relevant that you are satisfied/unsatisfied with? Please describe here_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q34b

Is there anything else relevant that you are satisfied/unsatisfied with?

In the following section we will be asking about how maintaining of parks and green spaces and or streetscene might change over the next 5 years.

Q35
Changes in the role, functions and priorities of your department.

	Not at all 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	To a very high degree 10	Don't know
Has the role, functions and priorities of your department changed in the past 5 years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Do you expect the role, functions and priorities of your department will change in the next 5 years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q36**Operating budgets**

What is your department's annual revenue budget for maintenance and how is that changing?

Please estimate the budget in £ millions to a maximum of one decimal point e.g. £3.2mi. A good guess is better than no answer.

Q36a**Parks and green spaces**

This year my department has an budget for green space maintenance of approx.: _____

Since 2010 my department's budget for green space maintenance has... ☐ Stayed the same (no increase at all) ☐ Increased by approx. % ☐ Decreased by approx. % (☐ Don't know

Over the next 5 years I expect my department's budget for green space maintenance to.... ☐ Stayed the same (no increase at all) ☐ Increase (e.g. with inflation / real increase) ☐ Decrease ☐ Unable to predict this.

Q36b**Streetscene**

This year my department has a budget for maintenance relating to streetscene of approx.: _____

Since 2010 my department's budget for maintenance relating to streetscene has... ☐ Stayed the same (no increase at all) ☐ Increased by approx. % ☐ Decreased by approx. % ☐ Don't know

Over the next 5 years I expect my department's budget for maintenance relating to streetscene to.... ☐ Stay the same (no increase at all) ☐ Increase (e.g. with inflation / real increase) ☐ Decrease ☐ Unable to predict this.

Q36c

Please add specific comments relating to your reply here:

Q37**Changes in maintenance delivery****Q37a**

How do you expect the contribution of different organisations to parks and green spaces maintenance to change over the next 5 years?

Not able to predict how this might change. ☐

Private contractors	same <input type="checkbox"/>	increase <input type="checkbox"/>	decrease <input type="checkbox"/>	don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
In-house operation	same <input type="checkbox"/>	increase <input type="checkbox"/>	decrease <input type="checkbox"/>	don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
Other	same <input type="checkbox"/>	increase <input type="checkbox"/>	decrease <input type="checkbox"/>	don't know <input type="checkbox"/>

If you ticked 'other' can you please indicate to what extent you expect other organisations contribution to change over the next 5 years.

<input type="checkbox"/> Public / private joint venture	same <input type="checkbox"/>	increase <input type="checkbox"/>	decrease <input type="checkbox"/>	don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Local social enterprise	same <input type="checkbox"/>	increase <input type="checkbox"/>	decrease <input type="checkbox"/>	don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Other Government organisation (e.g. Environment Agency)	same <input type="checkbox"/>	increase <input type="checkbox"/>	decrease <input type="checkbox"/>	don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> National or local third sector organisation (e.g Wildlife Trust, RSPB).	same <input type="checkbox"/>	increase <input type="checkbox"/>	decrease <input type="checkbox"/>	don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Community Groups (e.g. Friends of groups).	same <input type="checkbox"/>	increase <input type="checkbox"/>	decrease <input type="checkbox"/>	don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Other – please specify	same <input type="checkbox"/>	increase <input type="checkbox"/>	decrease <input type="checkbox"/>	don't know <input type="checkbox"/>

Q37b

How do you expect the contribution of different organisations to steetscene maintenance to change over the next 5 years?

Not able to predict how this might change. ☐

Private contractors	same <input type="checkbox"/>	increase <input type="checkbox"/>	decrease <input type="checkbox"/>	don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
In-house operation	same <input type="checkbox"/>	increase <input type="checkbox"/>	decrease <input type="checkbox"/>	don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
Other	same <input type="checkbox"/>	increase <input type="checkbox"/>	decrease <input type="checkbox"/>	don't know <input type="checkbox"/>

Q38
Drivers for Change

Q38a

To what degree do you think the following will be drivers for change in the way you deliver maintenance over the next five years? Please answer for both parks and green spaces and/ or streetscene.

	Not at all 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	To a very high degree 10	Don't know
To achieve high-quality maintenance.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To achieve cost effective maintenance.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To ensure flexibility of service delivery.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To test and benchmark prices.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To carry out work that the local authority cannot do.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To develop and renew areas and services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To develop / improve internal working methods.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To comply with internal political aims	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To comply with external political aims (e.g localism)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To address changing budget pressures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To allow the department to focus on more strategic management rather than day to day delivery	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q39**Barriers to Change****Q39a**

Specify on a scale of 0-10 the degree to which the following are barriers to changing current practices for maintaining parks and green spaces and / or streetscene. Changes in practices may include those to deliver a more effective, efficient delivery, the ability to innovate / test new working practices.

Please tick if this applies.

☐ No changes are needed.

	Not at all 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	To a very high degree 10	Don't know
Local political aims or priorities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
National political aims or priorities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Internal aims or priorities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Local political culture (e.g. risk averse, inflexible.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Internal Local Authority staff culture (e.g. risk averse, inflexible.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lack of staff resources – skills / time	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lack of / or inflexible internal structures, procedures, systems (e.g. procurement.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lack of experience / knowledge (e.g. evidence for or examples of alternative approaches.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Uncertainty over future budgets / resources.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
User / community concerns.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q39b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Any other? Please include here _____												

Q40
Finally, we would like to ask a few questions about you

How many years have you been employed
with your current local authority? _____

How many years have you been employed
in the public sector? _____

In what year were you born? _____

What is your gender? _____

Q41

Would you like to receive a summary of the results of the survey when it has been completed?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Would you be happy to be contacted to participate further in this study e.g. a short interview as part of a case study?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Thanks for your participation